

HOUSING

Vol. 18

JUNE, 1929

No. 2

NEW YORK'S HOUSING DEBACLE

After 28 years' successful operation the New York Tenement House Law has been wiped off the statute books.

In its place there has been enacted a new law known as "the Multiple Dwelling Law". The new law is the result of two years' effort of a Commission appointed by the legislature and the Governor to modernize that statute.

The Tenement House Law represented the efforts of tenement house reformers, and was based on standards of hygiene and public safety in the interest of the community and of the people forced to dwell in such buildings.

The new Multiple Dwellings Law represents the desires and views of the real estate and building interests and of architects seeking to secure a maximum return for their clients.

There was much opposition to the new law in the legislature, and it passed that body by a very slight margin. Its fate with the Governor hung in the balance for weeks. There is still much opposition to it, and its validity is being tested in the courts.*

We publish in this issue an analysis of it by Lawson Purdy who served as Secretary of the Commission responsible for it. The fact that it was advocated by such men as Mr. Purdy—whose disinterestedness and public spirit no one can question—was largely responsible for its enactment. Neither the public nor the legislature, however, understood the law when it was proposed, nor do they now—for it is couched in such involved language that it is most difficult to understand.

There can be no doubt that the new law represents a retrograde movement in Housing Reform and not an advance.

In the City of Dreadful Height with the object lesson before all its citizens of the disadvantages of building to excessive heights, it deliberately permits an increase in height of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %. It lets down

* As we go to press, a decision holding the new law unconstitutional and void on technical grounds has been handed down by the Supreme Court. This decision will be appealed.—Editor.

standards pretty much all along the line—standards of light, of ventilation, of sanitation, of safety, of social well being. It legalizes thousands of unlawful buildings and gives a clean bill of health to the most brazen and flagrant attempt to “beat the law” ever conceived, putting millions of dollars into the pockets of these law violators.

Its influence on the rest of the country is not likely to be great—for no human being will lightly undertake the task of attempting to understand and translate into terms that are understandable to others the 174 pages of its involved and confused requirements.

NEW YORK'S SLUM CLEARANCE PROPOSALS

There has been a recent recrudescence of interest in the project to rebuild New York's lower East Side, or at least a part of it, and thus restore values in a very large area of property in that city.

That the East Side needs rebuilding is not to be gainsaid; but how it shall be rebuilt and by what methods open up very interesting questions. Our readers will recall that Mayor Walker some time ago announced his intention of wiping out New York's “obsolete” buildings, particularly on the lower East Side and replacing them with modern apartments. The project has gone through various stages which we need not restate here.

When we last discussed this question a year ago* the proposal had been changed from involving the building of a number of blocks of model tenements in connection with the widening of Allen Street, a main artery of traffic for New York's East Side, to a location further to the west, namely on Chrystie and Forsythe Streets and involved the demolition of 8 blocks of insanitary tenements in this part of the city and the building of modern improved buildings on the sites thus cleared.

After negotiations extending for several months it was announced last Fall that the exorbitant prices asked by the owners of the property affected had led the Administration to abandon the scheme, as Mayor Walker was definitely resolved not to resort to the expensive process of condemnation proceedings, saying that “the city invariably pays 200, 300, or 400% above assessed valuations for property acquired in that manner.”

So far as New Yorkers knew, the scheme thereupon was definitely abandoned. Recently, it has been revived by some of the East Side property owners who have been working on their associates, inducing them to be more moderate in the prices asked for their property. As a result of this effort, a public hearing was had recently before the local

* See “*Housing*”, June, 1928, p. 95.

authorities in New York, at which it was made evident that two-thirds of the property owners had agreed to content themselves with the "moderate" terms of an advance of but 20% over the assessed value of the property. When it is realized that property in New York City, under the law, is assessed at full value this does not seem like terms upon which successful model tenements to rent at \$10 a room can be erected.

In any event, the present situation is one which seems to encourage Mayor Walker and at latest writing it is announced that the scheme is to go through.

In some quarters it is believed that this recrudescence of interest in slum clearance is but a natural accompaniment of the approaching election and political campaign, but those who know Mayor Walker know well that his interest in this proposal is a genuine one and that he is keenly desirous of doing something to improve the housing conditions of the great masses of the people of the city. He very rightly, however, is unwilling to embark upon an enterprise where the land costs are of such nature as to jeopardize the success of the scheme.

GARDEN APARTMENTS FOR NEW YORK'S EAST SIDE

It really looks as if at last the East Side was to get its promised model tenements, which have been so much discussed for the past 3 years. These are not to be built as part of the city's slum clearance scheme but as a private enterprise by public spirited citizens, some of whom were East Side boys in their early days and who now have achieved positions of affluence and influence in the community. One of these is one of New York's leading bankers, Lieutenant Governor Herbert H. Lehman and the other is Aaron Rabinowitz, a leading realtor, and a member of the State Board of Housing. Acting as individuals in their own interest, it is reported that they have purchased 2 East Side blocks of property at almost the extreme point of New York's East Side on Grand Street, occupied by a great printing plant back to the time to which memory reaches not.

It is expected that the land and buildings which are to be erected on this site will cost approximately \$2,850,000. The work of demolition of the existing printing factory is soon to commence. It is stated that the land was purchased for \$500,000, or an average of about \$5 a square foot, which is held to be a low price, in view of the fact that the land is assessed for purposes of taxation at \$1,312,000. On this site will be erected Garden Apartments to house about 400 families, on the limited-dividend plan and presumably with tax exemption. Under the law,

if tax exemption is to be had, dividends will be limited to 6% on the investment and the average rental cannot exceed \$12.50 per room.

The property consists of the square block bounded by Grand, Sheriff, Broome and Delancey Streets and the adjacent block bounded by Broome, Sheriff, Delancey and Columbia Streets. In addition to these 2 blocks a further plot of 8,760 square feet has been acquired.

The type of house that is to be erected on this site will be very similar to the successful housing development recently opened in the Bronx by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. The houses will be either 5 or 6 stories in height, with large garden courts. It is hoped that it will be possible to include elevators, but that decision must rest upon the question of cost. In any event, 6-story walk-ups in this location would be a desirable type of development.

In addition, the buildings will contain meeting rooms for tenants, recreation rooms and a swimming pool—the latter is made possible by the fact that there are 10 artesian wells on the property. As the chief item of expense in the maintenance of a swimming pool is the charge for water, with practically unlimited water supply on the property, the cost of such a pool will be reduced to a minimum.

We predict that this will prove a most attractive and profitable feature of the development. Whether this pool is to be located in the building or in the garden has not yet apparently been decided, in any event no announcement has been made on that point. It is expected that the building will be completed and ready for occupancy by May 1st, 1930.

The East Side is to be congratulated upon this splendid piece of civic work and this great addition to the living accommodations of its people. Governor Lehman and Mr. Rabinowitz are very greatly to be commended for this splendid piece of good citizenship, and this contribution to the civic welfare of their city.

LABOR'S HOUSING SCHEME A SUCCESS

The Garden Apartments opened for occupancy eighteen months ago by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, have proved so popular—there being not a single vacancy in the building at the present time—that the promoters of this scheme have very wisely decided to take advantage of the ability to acquire property in the near neighborhood and have broken ground for 4 new units.

The new buildings which adjoin Van Cortland Park will be 6 stories high like the earlier group, but differ in one respect. They will be equipped with automatic elevators. These four new units will con-

tain living accommodations for 192 families in 720 rooms. This will bring the total capacity of the whole scheme up to over 2,000 persons.

George Gove, Secretary of the State Board of Housing, said not long ago that he considers these buildings of the Amalgamated Housing Corporation among the best model tenements in this country. We are inclined to agree with him. They have been well designed, well built and are being well managed under the leadership of the President of the Corporation, A. E. Kazan.

The example that has been thus set by one group of labor men in housing families of their own union should be followed by Labor all over the country. We see no reason why Labor should not similarly by cooperative effort house itself, just as it used to do in the old days when conditions were more primitive and when every man built his own home.

TOO MANY COOKS SPOIL THE GRAFT

Another stage has been reached in the attempt to escape the consequences of their evasion of the law by a group of New York "apartment house hotel" owners who have built numerous apartment houses in the guise of "hotels", for the purpose of escaping the more stringent requirements of the N. Y. tenement house laws—which control the conditions under which apartment houses may be erected—and enjoy the more liberal requirements that apply when a building is classed as "a hotel", and has only to comply with the requirements of the local building code—which are notoriously deficient in provision for light and ventilation.

We have discussed in these columns on various occasions the questions involved in this issue.* Although this case was started in 1927, a decision by the trial court on the issues involved was only had in March of 1929, nearly 2 years after the litigation was started. We predicted when we last discussed this question that its course through the courts would be a leisurely one, and we expressed the view then that we did not believe that the owners of these unlawful structures would fail to exhaust every legal means within their power to drag the case out, and ultimately secure a decision that would mean a saving to them of many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

As we anticipated, the court's decision in this case has been the only decision that an intelligent and conscientious judge could have rendered. Justice Bijur who is entitled to both of these appellations, has, in his decision—reported in the New York Law Journal of March 8th,

* See "Housing", June, 1928, p. 95; "Housing Betterment", May, 1927, p. 69; December, 1927, p. 310.

1929, *Apartment Hotel Owners Association Inc. v. City of New York et al*—sustained the contention of the city authorities and supported the tenement house law, and decided against the owners of these illegally constructed “apartment house hotels”.

The issues involved in this case while really quite simple have been made to appear complex by the owners of these unlawful buildings, who have sought to give the impression to the public that the sole issue involved was whether the occupants of such buildings should have the right to cook or not to cook.

It put the whole question in a rather ridiculous light in the minds of many people not familiar with the legal situation, for it seemed most unreasonable to say that a person might be allowed to cook in an apartment house built under the tenement house law, but could not be allowed to cook in an “apartment hotel”, built under another law. Of course that was not the issue.

The real issue was whether a group of property owners by evasion of the law could be permitted to operate as apartment houses, buildings which had been erected in the guise of hotels, and which had, therefore, been provided with very much less fire protection and means of egress and fire escapes than they would have, if erected as apartment houses, which were built to a greater height than was permitted in the case of apartment houses, which occupied more of the lot than apartment houses were permitted to occupy and which contained much less and greatly inadequate provision for light and ventilation for the various rooms.

In his decision, Justice Bijur said:

The defendant's (the city authorities') contention is that the presence of 'serving pantries' as constructed and used in the private apartments brings the buildings within the definition (of a tenement house).

He adds:

The apartments consist generally of 1, 2 and 3 rooms, and in those of more than 1 room there is a compartment or small room called a “serving pantry”, running in size up to about 8 by 12 feet, which contains a sink, an ice box, shelves or cupboard and an electric outlet into which can be inserted the ordinary portable electric plug. In very many instances electric ranges of varying dimensions have been installed in these pantries and they have been used by the guests with the knowledge of the owners of the buildings for the preparation of meals with more or less regularity. This use varies from the preparation of breakfasts only, or light lunches, to the cooking, in some cases at least, of all the meals for a family of 4. The owners of some of the buildings suggested the possibility of so using the pantries in their advertisements.

“LIVING INDEPENDENTLY OF EACH OTHER”

After thus describing the situation with regard to cooking, Justice Bijur, in his opinion takes up the contention of the owners of these buildings, that the guests or tenants do not live independently of each other, and, therefore, do not come within the terms of the exact definition of a tenement house as laid down in the tenement house law. On this point he says:

I come then to the question of whether the guests or tenants live, as phrased in the statute, “independently of each other,” and more particularly whether they are “doing their cooking upon the premises.” I think it quite probable that one of the purposes of prescribing that the families must be “living independently of each other” was to differentiate between families in the strict sense of the word, i. e. married couples and their own children, and combined “families” composed, for instance, of such couples and their married children and grandchildren or other relatives. In other words, I think that the intention was to describe “households” rather than families. But plaintiff contends in substance that its guests do not live independent of each other, because of the enjoyment of many common facilities. It is quite apparent that strictly speaking no one in the City of New York lives independently of anybody else. All enjoy the benefits and protection of the several city departmental agencies and the various public utilities. The same is true both of hotels and apartment houses. There are to day so many common conveniences, such as elevators, interior telephones, heating, lighting, window cleaning and the like that no occupants can be said, strictly speaking, to live independently of the others.

THAT QUESTION OF COOKING

With regard to cooking Judge Bijur says:

In regard to the element of cooking, plaintiff stresses the fact that the statute does not say “cooking” nor “any cooking”, but “*their* cooking”. He fails to take into account, however, the fact that the statute also does not say “*all* their cooking”. Of course, it never was intended in the definition to suggest that any family or household *must* cook *all* its meals on the premises, or even to define the exact extent to which cooking must go. Necessarily that would vary according to the individual means, wants and tastes of each family.

He adds:

While, perhaps, the “serving pantries” now in question were not designed for the preparation of elaborate meals for many persons simultaneously, there can be prepared therein meals quite as extensive in number of dishes and content as were cooked in many of the tenement houses of 30 or 40 years ago. Furthermore, the very design of these “apartment hotels” indicates that they are intended to accommodate small families. * * *

In a literal sense cooking done in these apartments is as to the occupants “their cooking”. This is emphasized by the unwillingness of plaintiff’s members to accept the city’s proposal to be satisfied

with a discontinuance of the conveniences for cooking as, for example, by removing the electric outlet. The refusal indicates that the accommodation for cooking sought to be treated by plaintiff in argument as negligible is in reality important and intrinsic in the very scheme of the buildings. Nor may it be overlooked that the legislature sought to define the building by the character of the residence, and not to control or direct an amount or kind of cooking.

It seems unlikely that this decision will be appealed to the higher courts and a definitive decision handed down by the court of last resort on the legal questions involved, in view of the fact that the new Multiple Dwelling Law, referred to elsewhere in this issue*, legalizes these unlawful buildings upon the making of slight alterations intended to reduce the hazard in case of fire.

Of course if the higher courts sustain the decision of the lower courts holding the new Dwelling Law unconstitutional and void, the whole issue of these illegal "apartment house hotels" will be again thrown back into the courts, to be once more thrashed out.

NEW YORK'S NEW HOUSING LAW

In consequence of a request of the Real Estate Board of New York the legislature of 1927 provided for the appointment of a Commission to Examine and Revise the Tenement House Law, applicable to the cities of New York and Buffalo.

The Commission consisted of four senators appointed by the President of the Senate, three assemblymen appointed by the Speaker, and three persons appointed by the Governor. Governor Smith appointed Darwin R. James, Raymond V. Ingersoll, and Lawson Purdy, all of whom were in favor of the best housing standards obtainable. Harold Riegelman was appointed Counsel to the Commission. For ten years he had been counsel to the United Neighborhood Houses which is an indication of his attitude of mind toward housing.

The appointment of the Commission did not proceed from any dissatisfaction upon the part of those who for nearly 30 years had defended the present law, but from builders and developers who thought certain features of the law were obsolete and who desired changes.

The Commission presented a bill to the legislature of 1928, which met serious opposition† on various grounds, chiefly that it put too much limitation upon the bulk of buildings and divided the city into two zones in accordance with land values, and in the larger zone of lower value imposed still greater restrictions upon bulk. The bill failed of

* See page 82.

† See "Housing", June, 1928, p. 92.—Editor.

passage and at the request of the real estate boards a second bill was enacted providing for the addition of three members to the Commission and extending its life for another year. Three additional members were appointed who were satisfactory to the real estate boards. They were Messrs. H. H. Murdock, Hubert F. Breitwieser, and L. C. L. Smith. Mr. Murdock is an architect of experience; Mr. Breitwieser is Vice President of the New York Title and Mortgage Company, head of its Brooklyn office, and exceedingly well informed concerning tenement building in Brooklyn; Mr. Smith is President of the Chamber of Commerce of Queens and familiar with the housing development in Queens which is largely of one and two-family houses. These gentlemen undertook the work assigned to the Commission with diligence, industry, and much knowledge of the subject.

A new bill was prepared in 1928 and introduced in the legislature of 1929. This bill applied only to cities with a population of 800,000 or more, but other cities, towns or villages may adopt its provisions. At the public hearings on the bill very wide support developed. The real estate boards, builders, and architects were substantially unanimous in their support and many social agencies appeared in favor of the bill.

The objections raised at the public hearings were four in number. The City of New York and a few others objected that the bill violated the spirit of home rule and the constitutional provisions guaranteeing home rule to the cities of the State; also that the limitations proposed on height and bulk were excessive, that height and bulk should be left to the determination of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York as expressed through the Zoning Ordinance.

Owners of old-law tenement houses built prior to 1901 objected that the bill imposed new and unreasonable burdens of expense in the improvement of old tenement houses. The United Neighborhood Houses through their Executive Committee objected that the provisions for new houses permitted too great height and too much bulk; also that the time had come when a definite date should be set subsequent to which no room in an old-law tenement house should be occupied unless it had windows opening upon an open space of prescribed size; also that at least one toilet should be provided for every family.

THE MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

The Tenement House Law of 1901 as originally enacted was admirably clear and comparatively simple. It has been the model for much, if not all, of the tenement house legislation enacted throughout the United States since its enactment. It dealt with the subject functionally; light and ventilation; protection from fire; sanitary pro-

visions and other requirements. Since the enactment of the law there have been about 150 amendments, chiefly by way of exceptions. The most serious changes related to the conversion of single-family houses into tenement houses by which the requirements for converted buildings were relaxed.

One of the most admirable features of the Tenement House Law of 1901 as originally enacted was that no building could be converted into a tenement house unless it complied with all the requirements for a tenement house "hereafter erected".

The Multiple Dwelling Law provides requirements not only for what have heretofore been known as tenement houses, that is, buildings in which three or more families live independently of each other and do their own cooking on the premises, but also for all houses occupied by three or more families whether they do their own cooking or not. For that reason it seemed to the Commission that, in spite of the necessity for using more words, it would make for clarity and convenience if the arrangement of the law were by classes of buildings instead of by functions. Thus, the Multiple Dwelling Law has articles on fireproof multiple dwellings, non-fireproof multiple dwellings, converted dwellings, existing multiple dwellings, requirements, and so forth. One article deals with multiple dwellings generally and that article contains all the provisions applicable to all buildings alike concerning light and air, fire protection, and sanitation. Partly because the Multiple Dwelling Law deals with more classes of buildings, partly because of the different plan of the law, it exceeds by over 60% the length of the Tenement House Law. It is therefore a more formidable statute to study, but that seems inevitable because of its wider scope.

I shall endeavor to explain the chief provisions of the Multiple Dwelling Law and compare them with the similar provisions of the Tenement House Law.

The Multiple Dwelling Law applies to all multiple family-dwellings which include hotels.

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

MAXIMUM PERMITTED HEIGHT

I. LIGHT AND AIR

HEIGHT

One and one-half times the width of the widest street on which the building faces except that above that height the build-

I. LIGHT AND AIR

HEIGHT

One and one-half times the width of the widest street. Entire building takes its height from the widest street regardless

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

ing may rise 3 feet for each foot it sets back to a maximum height of 3 feet plus one and three-quarter times the width of the street. The height of a building on a corner lot is governed by the wider street for a distance of not more than 150 feet from the street line. The height of every portion of a building on an interior lot, running through from street to street, is determined by the width of the street to which such portion is nearer.

(Walls on the side lot line at a height equal to one and one-half times the width of the street must set back from the lot line 10 feet for one additional story and one foot further for each additional story.)

PENT HOUSE

A pent house may be erected above the maximum height of any fireproof multiple dwelling in which one or more power passenger elevators are provided the height of which does not exceed 12 feet and the walls of which set back from the outer face of the front parapet wall not less than 5 feet and from the outer face of the rear parapet wall not less than 10 feet and from the inner face of every other parapet wall not less than 3 feet.

DORMER

Above the height limit prescribed for the street wall a dormer may be erected which is not more than 60 per cent. of the frontage of the street wall but not exceeding 60 feet for any one dormer. The dormer may extend in height two stories and above that if set back one foot for each 3 feet but may not exceed the maximum height. The frontage length of a dormer must be decreased on each side one foot for each 3 feet above the level permitted for the street wall at the street line. No dormer shall be less than 10 feet distant from any side lot line. If there is more than one dormer there shall be at least 15 feet between such dormers.

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

of the size of the building, or whether it runs through from street to street.

PENT HOUSE

Same provisions, except that the pent house may not cover more than 50 per cent. of the area of the roof and shall set back 10 feet from the front and rear walls.

DORMER

No provision for dormer because no additional height permitted if set back.

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

TRANSIENT HOTELS

Any fireproof transient hotel in which there are six or more power passenger elevators may be erected in a block no part of which is restricted to residential uses to any height and of any bulk permitted by the local zoning ordinance.

TOWER

On a lot of 30,000 square feet or more a tower may be erected having an aggregate area of not more than 20 per cent. of the lot, not exceeding in height three times the width of the widest street nor 300 feet, provided that neither the width nor the depth of the tower shall exceed 70 feet. Towers shall be distant from the nearest line of every adjoining lot not less than 70 feet and shall set back from the street line a distance not less than that required at the maximum permitted height level. If there is more than one tower they shall be separated by a distance not less than the width of the tower nor less than 45 feet.

BUILDING ON A PARK

Height determined by the width of the street alone, unless the park or public place abuts upon a waterway, but in no case is the street or open space deemed to be more than 100 feet wide.

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

TRANSIENT HOTELS

Hotels not included in the jurisdiction of the Tenement House Law.

TOWER

No tower provision.

BUILDING ON A PARK

Height limited to one and one-half times the width of the widest street upon which it stands. If the street is more than 100 feet wide the height is increased accordingly. In certain cases a court has held that a park is to be included as part of the street so that a 60 foot street plus a park is equivalent to a 100 foot street. In a recent case height was limited by width of street.

COMMENT AS TO HEIGHT

On a 100-foot street a greater height is allowed by the Multiple Dwelling Law than by the Tenement House Law, amounting to 28 feet. The cornice line is the same, 150 feet. On a 60 foot street an additional height is allowed of 18 feet.

In itself this greater height would be objectionable. There are two offsetting factors to be considered. As will appear later, yards and courts are about 25% greater in least dimension. This increase could not have been secured without allowing the additional height. Com-

parison should be made not only with the Tenement House Law but also with the Building Code. So-called apartment hotels could be erected under the Building Code, limited in height only by the Zoning Ordinance which in a one and a half times zone would permit the same cornice line as the Multiple Dwelling Law or the Tenement House Law and a greater height of 3 feet for each one foot set-back without any maximum limit and with permission to build a tower of unlimited height covering 25% of the lot.

The Tenement House Law allows a pent house covering 50% of the roof. The Multiple Dwelling Law allows a pent house of unlimited coverage except that it must set back on all sides. A pent house affords such a delightful residence that the slight difference in area is permitted to it, and in view of the set-back requirements does not seem objectionable.

The Tenement House Law does not permit any tower. The tower privilege under the Multiple Dwelling Law is so limited that very few towers are likely to be erected anywhere. If they are erected, being set back from the street as required and 70 feet from lot lines, and limited in size to 70 feet by 70 feet and permitted only on lots of 30,000 square feet or more, it does not seem that a tower limited to 300 feet high will be objectionable.

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

MINIMUM OPEN SPACES

YARDS AND COURTS

Per cent. of coverage unlimited.
Outer court between wings, same as yard. Outer court on lot line, half the width of yard depth.

Building 60 feet high: 15 feet.
Building 90 feet high: 20 feet.

Building above 90 feet: Building must be set back one foot for each 3 feet of vertical height.

For a building 150 feet, at the top of the building the yard would be 40 feet.

Thus at maximum height of 178 feet total depth of yard will be 49 feet, four inches.

For a building lower than 60 feet in height the depth of the yard is decreased by 3 inches for each foot to a minimum depth of 13 feet.

YARDS AND COURTS

Per cent. of coverage:
Corner lots, 90%; interior lots, 70%.
Same.

12 feet.
15 feet.

Above 60 feet the yard must increase throughout the entire height of the building by one foot for each 12 feet or fraction.

Thus for a building 150 feet high the yard must be 20 feet.

For a building lower than 60 feet the depth of the yard is decreased one foot for each 12 feet of reduction in height to a minimum depth of 10 feet.

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

Outer court extending from the street to the yard for a building not over 3 stories may be 5 feet.

Inner court enclosed on all four sides:

Building 60 feet: 25 ft. x 31 ft.

Building 90 feet: 30 ft. x 36 ft.

Above 90 feet: Both length and width shall be increased 4 inches for each foot in height.

Below 60 feet required length and width will be decreased 2 inches for each foot of height.

Either dimension of the court at any level may be decreased by not more than one-third provided the minimum area of the court is not diminished and the least dimension shall not be less than 20 feet.

For a building 60 feet high an inner court one side of which is on the lot line must be 15 feet by 25 feet. For each foot of increased height 2 inches are added to each dimension. For each foot of decreased height 2 inches are subtracted from each dimension.

The width or length may be reduced by 20 per cent. if the area is not diminished, but the width shall in no case be less than half the length nor less than 10 feet.

In the case of a 3 story house not occupied by more than one family on any floor and in which the ground floor is used for business purposes the court may be not less than 5 feet by 10 feet.

House extending from street to street on interior lot:

When the distance between two streets is more than 110 feet, a yard shall be required in the center of the lot midway between the two streets, except that when the building is not more than six stories in height it may be erected on an interior lot running through from street to street with a court on each side lot line running through from street to street.

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

Substantially the same.

Building 60 feet: 24 ft. x 24 ft.

Building 90 feet: 27 ft. x 27 ft.

Above 90 feet: Both dimensions increased one foot for every 12 feet of increase in height.

Below 60 feet decrease one foot for each 12 feet of decrease in height.

There are exceptions for buildings not over 4 stories under certain circumstances which permit the least dimension to be not less than 14 feet and when not over 3 stories not less than 8 ft. by 12½ feet.

When one side of an inner court is situated on the lot line it is one-half the size of an inner court enclosed on all four sides. There are various exceptions for buildings of four stories or less in height which permit a reduced size. The minimum size under certain circumstances is 49 square feet and not less than 4 feet in least dimension.

House extending from street to street on interior lot:

If the lot is more than 70 feet deep, the yard space must be left vacant through the center of the lot midway between the two streets.

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

Such court shall not be less than 15 feet for a distance of 40 feet from each street, and the remainder of the court shall not be less than 20 feet wide. The dimension increases if the streets are more than 200 feet apart.

Any inner court situated on a lot line may begin at the level of the floor of the lowest story in which there is a living room, but never at a point more than 50 feet above the curb level. An inner court not on a lot line may begin at any level, and the height of such court shall be measured from the level where such court begins.

Every inner court shall be provided with one or more intakes at the bottom of such court and shall have a vertical cross-section area of not less than 21 square feet nor less than 3 feet in its least dimension.

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

Substantially the same.

COMMENT ON YARDS AND COURTS

The Tenement House Law limits the coverage of interior lots to 70% and of corner lots to 90%. Almost without exception, architects advised that coverage be limited only by the required dimensions of open spaces. Their opinion was that the limitation of coverage very rarely worked an improvement in light and air under the present law, that open spaces should be required to be larger than the Tenement House Law provides, and that no good purpose would be served by adding a limitation upon coverage.

It will be noted that one dimension at least of yards and courts is increased by about 25% by the Multiple Dwelling Law over the dimension required by the Tenement House Law. Thus the yard of a 60 foot building is required to be 12 feet deep by the Tenement House Law and 15 feet deep by the Multiple Dwelling Law. The Tenement House Law requires a yard of the minimum depth for the entire height of the building. The Multiple Dwelling Law requires a yard to be 20 feet deep for the entire height of a building 90 feet high, but above that point the building may be set back in the ratio of one to three. At the 90 foot level the Tenement House Law requires a yard 15 feet deep and the Multiple Dwelling Law requires a yard 20 feet deep. At the 150 foot level the Tenement House Law requires 20 feet which is the same for the entire height of the building, and the Multiple Dwelling Law increases the yard at 150 feet high to a depth of 40 feet.

The increase in open spaces required by the Multiple Dwelling Law must be taken into account in considering the permitted increase in height. The band of light on the floor of the lowest story of all windows on yards and courts is materially greater in the case of a building of maximum height under the Multiple Dwelling Law than under the Tenement House Law. On the other hand, the band of light on the floor of the lowest story on the street front is slightly decreased under the Multiple Dwelling Law as compared with the Tenement House Law. As two-thirds or more of the windows are usually situated on yards and courts, it seems that the advantage of light and air in buildings of maximum height is somewhat greater under the Multiple Dwelling Law than under the Tenement House Law.

A slight elasticity is afforded by the Multiple Dwelling Law by the permission to reduce one dimension of inner courts provided the other dimension is so increased that the area of the court is not diminished. The opinion of architects who appeared before the Commission was almost unanimous that this was a very decided advantage in the matter of planning and that it would not affect light adversely.

When the distance between two parallel streets is greater than 70 feet the Tenement House Law does not permit a building to be constructed solid from one street to the other. This provision is intended to secure block ventilation. It sometimes happens that under the Tenement House Law the position of the yard is not such as to afford block ventilation and the Multiple Dwelling Law gives certain discretion to the Department to direct the location of the yard and connecting courts in such fashion as shall best promote block ventilation.

The Multiple Dwelling Law permits a building not more than six stories in height, erected on an interior lot running through from street to street to have an outer court on each side lot line in lieu of a yard. For the first 40 feet from the street such court shall not be less than 15 feet wide and the remainder of the court not less than 20 feet. If the distance from street to street is greater than 200 feet that part of the court which is at a greater distance than 40 feet from the nearest street shall be increased one inch for every 2 feet that the distance from street to street is greater than 200 feet. It will be observed that at its narrowest point this court has the width of a yard and it seemed that block ventilation would be secured as well by a court so placed as though the yard were midway between the streets and, at the same time, under certain circumstances large building units might be constructed which would afford more light and air and more of the amenities and be cheaper to maintain than if two separate buildings were required. The height of such a building was limited to six

stories because it seemed that a building of greater height running through the block would cast a shadow on other buildings to such a degree as to be detrimental.

MULTIPLE DWELLING LAW

FIRE PROTECTION

Buildings not exceeding six stories may be non-fireproof.

In every multiple dwelling exceeding three stories in height the first floor above the cellar must be fireproof.

EGRESS

Non-fireproof buildings over two stories in height must have two means of egress extending from the ground floor to the roof. One such egress shall be a stair lighted by windows, if over three stories in height, or by a skylight if three stories or less. The other means of egress may be a fire stair or fire tower or a fire escape.

If the number of living rooms in a non-fireproof multiple dwelling on any floor above the entrance floor exceeds 20 there shall be additional means of egress for each 20 rooms or fraction thereof.

A fireproof multiple dwelling shall have at least two fire stairs and if the number of rooms on any floor above the entrance floor exceeds 40 there shall be an additional fire stair for each 20 rooms.

A fireproof multiple dwelling not exceeding six stories, having no more than four apartments on any floor nor more than 20 rooms may have but one stair.

TENEMENT HOUSE LAW

FIRE PROTECTION

Same.

In every tenement house exceeding four stories in height the first floor above the cellar must be fireproof.

EGRESS

Every tenement house, both fireproof and non-fireproof exceeding two stories in height, shall have two independent ways of egress which shall extend from the ground floor to the roof. One such egress shall be stairs lighted by windows unless the building is four stories or less in height and has no more than two families on a floor.

Every non-fireproof tenement house containing over 26 apartments above the entrance floor shall have an additional flight of stairs for every additional 26 apartments.

Every fireproof tenement house containing over 36 apartments above the entrance floor shall have an additional flight of stairs for every additional 36 apartments.

COMMENT ON EGRESS

The provisions for egress in both the Multiple Dwelling Law and the Tenement House Law are somewhat complicated. Certain changes have been made in the Multiple Dwelling Law to meet new conditions. When the Tenement House Law was enacted, apartments in fireproof houses were usually of large size and the number of stairs was based on the number of apartments in the building. The demand now is for apartments of three rooms or less and it is necessary to base the number

of stairs upon the number of rooms per floor rather than upon the number of apartments above the entrance floor.

The Tenement House Law permits exterior, iron fire escapes as one means of egress for any height. The Multiple Dwelling Law permits exterior, iron fire escapes for buildings of six stories or less, but not for higher buildings. The Tenement House Law makes no provision for what is called the fire stair, which is an ordinary stair without windows to the outer air, in non-fireproof houses. The Multiple Dwelling Law permits a fire stair in addition to the window-lighted stair for non-fireproof buildings instead of an exterior fire escape.

Prior to 1913 for 12 years the Tenement House Law required but one means of egress in fireproof houses. No accident appears to have occurred in such a house and the Multiple Dwelling Law permits a six story fireproof house to have but one stairway provided there are not more than four apartments or more than a total of twenty rooms on any floor having access to the single stairway. This obviously gives greater freedom of planning, saves the expense of the extra means of egress, and the ugly exterior fire escape.

It is claimed that the saving in better planning makes possible six-story fireproof houses for the cost of non-fireproof. The saving in amortization alone would be one and one-half per cent. ($1\frac{1}{2}\%$) annually on the cost of construction.

In non-fireproof buildings public halls must be lighted by a window, with the exception of three story dwellings with not more than two families on a floor, which may be lighted by a skylight. Public halls in fireproof buildings are not required to have windows, but if no windows are provided gravity ventilation through ducts is required.

A cellar is more than half its height below the curb level. The Tenement House Law does not allow the occupancy of cellar apartments except by the janitor. The Multiple Dwelling Law permits living rooms, when below the highest curb of the multiple dwelling on a sloping lot, if the building below the highest grade is of fireproof construction and the rooms are above the grade of the yard or court and the yards and courts are of such width as the height of the building requires when measured from the level of the yard or court.

In the rear of every non-fireproof multiple dwelling in which rooms below the level of the highest curb in front of said dwelling are occupied, the yard at the level of such curb shall be at least 8 feet greater in depth than the yard in the rear of such dwelling below the level of the curb. This 8 foot set-back is called a fire terrace. If the building runs through from street to street there must be a fire terrace on the front of the building facing the lower street. Such fire terrace shall be at

the level of the curb of the higher street. That part of the building below the fire terrace must be fireproof. Egress must be had to the fire terrace from the portion of the building above it and from the portion of the building below it. The fire terrace must be connected with the street by a covered, fireproof passage.

When a multiple dwelling fronts on two or more streets and the difference in the level between the highest point of the curb on the front of the building and the lowest point of the curb in front of the building on the lowest street is greater than 10 feet, a garage not more than two stories high may be maintained at or above the level of the street of lowest grade. The floor below the curb of the highest street must be unpierced, fireproof, and capable of resisting an upward pressure of 120 pounds per square foot. There are other conditions to insure safety.

SANITATION

Both the Tenement House Law and the Multiple Dwelling Law require at least one water closet for each apartment in a non-fireproof house with a window to the outer air. In fireproof tenement houses in which one or more power passenger elevators are provided and operated, water closets and bath rooms which are supplementary to those required by law may be ventilated by individual vent flues under the Tenement House Law.

The Multiple Dwelling Law contains a similar provision except that there must be mechanical ventilation. It is further provided that in such a fireproof multiple dwelling in which every room opens directly upon a public hall without any intervening room the apartment may have water closet compartments mechanically ventilated. This last provision, with certain further conditions, is intended to provide for the case of the apartment hotel in which there are apartments of but a single room or two rooms. In both the Tenement House Law and the Multiple Dwelling Law the intent was to prevent apartments likely to be occupied by large families and especially those likely to be rented for low rents from having water closets not lighted and ventilated by a window. In fireproof elevator houses there was deemed less necessity for such a requirement.

CONVERTED HOUSES

The Tenement House Law of 1901 provided that any house altered into a tenement house must comply with the provisions of the law for houses thereafter erected. This is an admirable provision. The stress of circumstances induced the amendment of the Tenement House Law

so as to let down these requirements under certain circumstances for the alteration of single family houses.

The Commission which framed the Multiple Dwelling Law was confronted with the fact that there are more than 10,000 houses which have been altered legally under the Building Code for non-housekeeping use and that substantially all of them are occupied for housekeeping use. The converted dwelling is treated under the principle that no changes can be required of houses converted under the Tenement House Law and few changes can be required of houses converted under the Building Code, but more substantial changes are required in future conversions.

Houses converted either under the Tenement House Law or under the Building Code must confine cooking to a fire-retarded closet or recess of limited size opening into a room that has a window to the outer air or to a fire-retarded kitchenette with window or to a full size kitchen with window.

Cellars may not be occupied for living purposes. Cellar ceilings must be fire-retarded. When a dwelling exceeds three stories and basement either two means of egress from each apartment must be provided or one means of egress and a sprinkler system for stairs and halls. The doors entering into halls must be self-closing. Cellar stairs must be enclosed in fire-retarded partitions. Cellars must be accessible from outside the dwelling. Every required stair in a converted dwelling exceeding three stories in height must extend through a bulkhead to the roof unless such dwelling does not exceed three stories and basement and is occupied by not more than one family on a floor.

Generally dwellings hereafter converted must meet the following additional requirements:

Yards must be at least 13 feet deep. Every room must be at least 8 feet high and 6 feet wide, must open to the outer air through a window or skylight equal to one-tenth the floor area. Where a dwelling hereafter converted exceeds two stories in height there must be two means of egress or a stair with sprinklers. A dwelling hereafter converted must have one water closet in each apartment. There are other requirements of less importance.

During the period of housing shortage many dwellings were converted under the Building Code and many were converted in use though not structurally altered. It is generally believed now that such conversions will not be profitable to any considerable extent. They are not desirable and any relaxation of the old rule of the Tenement House Law is a concession forced by political exigencies.

The Multiple Dwelling Law contains provisions supplementing the provisions of the Building Code in relation to boarding houses, lodging houses, and hotels, but the scope of this article is limited to an explanation of the more important differences between the Tenement House Law in its treatment of tenement houses and the Multiple Dwelling Law in its treatment of the same class of houses and what are now known as apartment hotels, which are subject to all the provisions of the Multiple Dwelling Law as applied to what are now known as tenement houses.

The Commission in drafting the Multiple Dwelling Law endeavored to meet the conditions of 1929, to maintain the adequate fire protection provided in the Tenement House Law and the sanitary provisions of that law, to decrease the cost of building by change in the rules relating to stairs, and to increase open spaces. Experience will demonstrate in time whether or not the Commission has succeeded.

LAWSON PURDY
New York

THE EVER-NARROWING HOME

That there is a constant trend toward smaller and smaller homes for the average family, has been evidenced for some time past. Just how far that tendency has spread, however, has not been fully apprehended. In New York City, the official figures of the Tenement House Department, show an amazing trend in the direction of smaller and smaller homes, that is, homes with a less number of rooms. The figures for the past 10 years are most enlightening. In 1918 of the 130 new multiple-dwellings projected for that year, which included 2706 apartments and 11,332 rooms, the average number of rooms to the apartment was 4.19; there were no 1-room apartments, only 75 2-room apartments, and but 835 3-room apartments. Out of the whole 11,332 rooms but $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total apartments provided were of 3 rooms or less.

Contrast these with the official figures for the year 1928. In that year 3,580 new buildings were projected, containing 72,687 apartments and including 245,549 rooms. Here, however, the average number of rooms to the apartment was but 3.37. In place of no 1-room apartments as in 1918, there were 888 1-room apartments projected; 7,251 2-room apartments as compared with 75 10 years earlier, and 39,849 apartments of 3 rooms as compared with 835 in 1918. The percentage of small apartments today is 77.3 as compared with 33.6% 10 years ago—which is a striking change.

While there is probably no other city in the United States that can supply the information, for there is no other city that keeps statistics of housing and building in the same detailed and satisfactory condition that New York does, owing to the provisions of the laws enacted in 1901, which require it, the chances are that a similar tendency would be visible in all the large cities of the country.

The consequences of these changes are far-reaching.

ARE OUR CITIES DECENTRALIZING?

That question of decentralization of population which housing reformers and city planners consider of such importance is having a very actual demonstration in New York City.

Notwithstanding its 6,000,000 population, the central parts of New York City are rapidly losing population and the suburbs are gaining. Figures recently published show that while the Borough of Manhattan in the 10 years ending in 1920 lost over 2% of its population, there was a very rapid acceleration of the population to the suburbs and to the outlying Boroughs in the succeeding 5 years, the loss in population in Manhattan during the period from 1920 to 1925 being at the rate of 15% decrease. Since 1920 the central island of Manhattan has actually lost a total of 523,000 residents—enough to make a good sized city.

At the same time the population of Nassau County on Long Island and Westchester County to the north have almost doubled, and there have been corresponding increases in the outlying sections of the other 4 boroughs of the Greater City. People seem to be getting further and further out, a tendency naturally to be expected in view of the increasing use of the automobile and the decreasing livability of the city itself. Sales of tickets by the Long Island Railroad showed a persistent decrease in the 10-mile zone but in the 10- to 15-mile zone of distance from Manhattan such sales have practically doubled since 1922.

The most heavily populated sections of Manhattan have thinned out considerably. Two Assembly Districts which had density populations of 400,000 and 387,000 persons per square mile in the year 1900 were reduced to a maximum of only 261,000 per square mile in 1920, and will presumably be considerably less in the next census. One of the interesting and hopeful signs of this trek of the people away from the congested and more densely occupied portions of cities is that it is chiefly to be found among persons with families. People with children who are able to escape do so, finding the city no longer a proper place in which to bring up children. There are many who also think that it is rapidly ceasing to be a place in which adults may live with health and comfort.

How long a city can go on developing in this fashion with great concentration of population in comparatively limited centers, before the city authorities wake up to the fact that that kind of concentrated development, while putting money in the pockets of a few individuals, is not a good thing and in the long run does not pay, is to be determined.

WHAT ARE "CHARITY TENEMENTS"?

THE LAVANBURG HOMES

In place of the old slogan of "Philanthropy and Five Per Cent", a new one apparently impends of "Philanthropy and No Per Cent".

Much discussion has been going on recently among those interested in housing in New York as to what constitute "charity tenements". It has been occasioned by the policy of the donors of the Lavanburg Homes, which has recently completed its first year of operation.

This model tenement building, located on the lower East Side of New York at 124-142 Goerck Street, is being rented to 113 families who live in it without profit or any return whatever to the owners on the investment—which in round figures amounts to about three quarters of a million dollars.

From the point of view of an investor it would seem as if the term "charity tenements" was justified; for, it certainly is a form of philanthropy to rent buildings on other than a commercial basis, and to omit so important an item in the rent as the interest on three quarters of a million dollars.

On the other hand, from the point of view of the tenant, apartments for which families pay \$32.50 a month rent as the minimum, up to \$45.50 a month as the maximum, can hardly be said to be "charity tenements"—at least certainly not from their point of view.

Whether this interesting model tenement has this label affixed or not, the fact remains that it is a fine undertaking, affording, as its projectors intended, comfortable, sanitary and attractive homes to 113 families and to families who, otherwise, would not have that kind of living accommodations.

The First Annual Report of the operation of the Lavanburg Homes has recently been made public. It is written by the Supervisor, Abraham Goldfeld, a trained social worker, who has brought to the task a fine social spirit as well as a practical ability that has insured the success of the enterprise from the start.

All students of housing, especially those interested in that form of housing reform which seeks expression in the building of model houses, will find it well worth while to obtain a copy of this Report from the Lavanburg Foundation at 100 William Street, New York City.

WHERE ARE "THE POOR"?

One of the most interesting features of the enterprise has been the enlightenment of its projectors as to economic conditions in New York. When the idea of building a model tenement in the heart of the lower East Side for people who could not obtain the right kind of accommodations otherwise was first thought of, Mr. Lavanburg and those associated with him decided that they would limit the occupancy of the building to tenants whose income did not exceed \$25 a week.

When it came to renting the apartments, however, they found that "there weren't no sich animal"—that no families were to be found with that low income. Consequently, they were compelled to raise this limit to \$45 instead of \$25. That alone would almost seem to have justified the erection of the building.

This should prove an eye-opener to those sentimentalists in housing who are all the time talking of "housing the very poor", of "housing the little scrub woman" and of building houses that can rent for \$5 per month per room, etc. In recent years the people of New York have been subjected to a great deal of that kind of loose thinking. It is most instructive and fortunate that so practical an object lesson should have been had as has been furnished by the experience of the Lavanburg Homes in making plain the changed standards of living that have come about in New York City as well as in the rest of the country.

The Lavanburg Homes, because of its apparently nonprofit-making character and the desires of its donors, has been in a position where it was not only free to select tenants but was rather under the nature of compulsion to do so.

How to select the 113 families who were to reside in the Lavanburg Homes was a problem that gave those responsible for this enterprise some concern. In view of the low rentals asked and the non-profit making nature of the scheme it was decided not to take tenants whose incomes permitted them to pay a higher rental. In order to determine what constituted the right income for each individual family who applied for residence the family budgets of the Jewish Social Service Association were used. In addition to considerations of income, satisfactory standards of living were factors of importance for eligibility. In the effort to determine to what extent the numerous applicants for apartments in this group of buildings measured up to these standards 850 families were visited in their homes and about 200 of them were accepted for preliminary consideration.

One of the determining factors in accepting tenants was the presence or absence of children in the family. Contrary to the point of view of the ordinary landlord, absence of children was a factor which

made for rejection, while the presence of large numbers of children was an element that led to the determination to accept such families. The Foundation decided to limit tenancy to families with small children—as where there were grown children, or children earning, the family income of such a family would be large enough to meet a higher rental elsewhere—as it was one of the primary purposes of the Foundation to provide a home for people of limited income.

Another consideration was the conditions under which people were living at the time. If they already had decent living quarters at the time of application they were not considered eligible for apartments in the new building.

How thoroughly the selection of tenants was done is instanced by the statement that after tenants were tentatively selected, their employers were visited to check up on their incomes and further investigation was made through the Social Service Exchange. Out of 200 families investigated about 90 were eliminated because of their dissatisfaction with the apartments assigned to them.

A study of 930 rejected applications indicates that they were rejected for the following reasons:

High income 535; low standard of living 90; no children 91; grown-up children 137; miscellaneous (living in modern buildings, keeping boarders, etc.) 71.

HOW MANY ROOMS DO PEOPLE WANT?

Considerable light was thrown on the desires of people at the present day with regard to large or small apartments, by the number of rooms that the applicants asked for. 413 families applied for 3-room apartments; 613 families applied for 4-room apartments and only 104 families applied for 5-room apartments. From which it is seen that the 3- and 4-room apartment is the popular method of living and that the 4-room apartment is the one that is more desired than any other.

The buildings are 6 stories high and contain 113 apartments in all, of which 51 are 3-room apartments, 48 4-room apartments and 14 5-room apartments. The average dimensions of the rooms are as follows:

Living room 10 feet, 6 inches by 15 feet; bedrooms 9 feet by 12 feet; kitchens 7 feet by 11 feet, and bath rooms 4 feet 8 inches by 8 feet.

The apartments have every modern convenience. They are equipped with steam heat, hot water, electricity, dumbwaiters, ample closet space and hard wood floors. The kitchens have 2 porcelain stationary wash tubs, porcelain sink, gas range, electric outlets, combination ice box and kitchen closet, shelves, overhead clothes dryers and a receptacle for garbage cans. The plumbing throughout the build-

ing is of brass instead of iron. Bath rooms are tiled and fully equipped with built-in tub and shower baths and wash basins.

While the buildings are not Garden Apartments, most of the rooms open on the street or yard or on a large outer court and the apartments are so arranged that the majority of them are provided with cross-ventilation. There is a large screened-in playground on the roof, protected by a parapet wall and the roof has been built especially strong, so as to afford a place where the children may play unmenaced by the dangers of street traffic.

In the basement there are various community activities. An assembly hall is available for theatricals and parties and there are club-rooms for juvenile and adult clubs. A room to store baby carriages has been provided and other parts of the basement are used for a Summer School and Library.

The weekly rentals of the apartments are as follows:

3-room apartments, \$7.50; 4-room apartments, \$8.50; and 5-room apartments, \$10.50.

As the buildings are walk-ups, the apartments situated on the fifth floor are rented at a reduction of 25 cents a week and the apartments on the 6th or top floor at a reduction of 50 cents a week. The buildings have been completely occupied from the day of opening in January, 1928, and there is a considerable waiting list. During the year there hasn't been a single change in tenancy. Rents have been paid promptly and there has been no need to remind tenants of their obligations. The Management finds the weekly rent system working satisfactorily.

One of the unique features of this enterprise is the method by which the tenants hold their apartments. There are no leases in the ordinary sense. Tenants, after being accepted by the management, agree to abide by the rules and regulations which is practically made a condition of their lease. A failure to accept the rules is made cause for dispossessing the tenant.

In the attempt to deal with the problem of taking in lodgers and boarders and to prevent overcrowding due to families of excessive size, the Management have assigned apartments with relation to the size of the family. The rules provide that no less than 3 and no more than 4 persons can occupy a 3-room apartment, 5 to 6 persons a 4-room apartment, and 7 to 8 persons a 5-room apartment, and in each family not more than 2 adults.

As indicative of the social outlook and the consideration of human needs that has been employed by the Management it is interesting to note that in deciding on what floors to assign the apartments, the supervisor considered the health needs of each family, such as cardiac cases,

high blood pressure, pregnancy, etc. Within these limitations, while the wishes of the prospective tenants were considered, they were not permitted to choose their apartments.

Thus far the building has been a very great success from every point of view. Not only have the public parts of the building been kept clean but there has been evident a very high standard of cleanliness and care of the building manifested by the tenants. Although the rules and regulations give the Management the right to enter an apartment in order to ascertain its condition, it has not been found necessary thus far to take advantage of these rules. On the contrary, efforts are made to do away with inspections. Entrance of apartments has been made only for the purpose of making repairs or adjustments and such entry has proved sufficient to present a view of the general state of the apartment visited. About 95% of the apartments revealed themselves as spotlessly clean.

Notwithstanding all of this concern for the welfare of the tenants the Management emphasizes the fact that there is no paternalism or institutionalism connected with the building.

The social activities carried on in the building are sufficient to constitute almost a social settlement in itself. When one reads the long list of such activities for adults, parents and children, one realizes the great value of a work of this kind.

All in all, the development is one which must be gratifying to its donors.

ZONING IN SIGHT FOR PHILADELPHIA

The Pennsylvania Legislature, which has recently closed its session, attempted to make trouble for persons working for housing betterment in Philadelphia and then sought to pacify them by passing one piece of constructive legislation.

The outstanding measure of housing significance was the Woodward Zoning Bill which Governor John S. Fisher signed. The troublesome legislation was in the form of four undesirable bills which were fortunately checked by veto of the Governor, who condemned the proposed interference with the freedom of action of the Department of Health in the abatement of bad housing conditions.

Two of these were amendments to the housing code:—one to permit the erection of tenement houses without sewer connection, and the other, to change the definition of a rooming house. The latter would have taken about one half of the rooming houses of the city from the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, and thus would have caused a break down in the present standard of sanitary occupancy.

The two other vetoes were equally noteworthy. One repudiated the Daix Garage Bill which, if signed, would have forbidden injunction proceeding against commercial garages until after they had been operated and were proven a nuisance. The other was the Royle Zoning Bill, an emasculated duplicate of the Woodward Zoning Bill. The Royle bill would have restricted the scope of zoning and thrown numerous cases into court because of the inadequate definition of the areas which Council might zone.

The Woodward Bill, which gives Philadelphia permission to adopt a zoning ordinance, will stand comparison with the zoning enabling acts on the statute books of over 30 states. It is modeled after and follows closely the Standard State Zoning Enabling Act of the U. S. Department of Commerce. In addition, it authorizes a Bureau of Zoning, establishes penalties, and contains a validity section to care for adverse court decisions, if such should be rendered against any of its provisions. In signing this bill Governor Fisher has given Philadelphia the most far-reaching legislation of beneficial character which has passed the General Assembly in many years. The Governor's stand on these five bills is evidence of a clear understanding of the housing problems of first class cities and of a broad statesmanlike view of the needs of Philadelphia, and is in keeping with his pre-election promise to help maintain good housing standards.

Prior to this action of the Governor, the City Council of Philadelphia, at the request of the Mayor, passed a resolution endorsing the Woodward Bill, and three Councilmen appeared at the hearing in Harrisburg and requested the enactment of the bill into law. Moreover, while this authority was being granted by the state legislature, the councilmanic body enacted a companion piece of legislation creating a City Planning Commission. The agitation for this Commission was begun some months ago by local organizations who persuaded the Mayor to call together 300 citizens to advise on the plan and scope of a Planning Commission. Following the enthusiastic reception of the proposal, Mayor Mackey prepared and sent to City Council an ordinance creating a Committee of 15 members, which the Council passed in record time.

The outlook for the passage of a zoning ordinance and the appointment of a City Planning Commission for Philadelphia is today most gratifying. To all appearances, the efforts of the Housing Association in furthering these two projects for many years are about to reach fruition.

BERNARD J. NEWMAN
Philadelphia

PHILADELPHIA REALTORS FOR ZONING

That the predictions made by Mr. Newman in the foregoing article are likely to be realized is evidenced by the fact that the Philadelphia Real Estate Board—which has all these years actively opposed zoning for Philadelphia—now seems to be coming into line for zoning, if one can judge from the editorial comment made in their organ the “Real Estate Magazine”. Commenting upon the new law they say:

“For realtors, the duty of the hour clearly is to very actively participate, in a public-spirited manner, in the deliberations in Council, so that the zoning ordinance for Philadelphia which shall be evolved, shall be wholly in the interest of all the people.

The zoning ordinance should look with a broad vision on the City Practical as well as the City Beautiful, for neither can reach its highest perfection without the other.”

Which, in view of the past attitude of this Board, makes “mighty interestin’ readin’.”

HOW GOVERNMENT CAN AND SHOULD AID HOUSING

There are many forces working to bring about better homes in Philadelphia. Some of these are commercial, some are governmental, and others are social in character. Few people seem to realize the influence which the ordinary functions of the municipal government have upon the kind and number of houses, their cost and selling price. It is not generally understood that it is the location of streets, their width and their direction, which determine the amount of direct sunlight which reaches the rooms of a dwelling, while the width of a street with its paving cost and service pipes materially affects the rental charges of a property. And further, the layout of the street may minimize or increase traffic hazards.

In like manner, if the plans for sewers and water pipes are in keeping with the need to make unbuilt-up areas ready for new dwelling operations, such construction is encouraged; but, if not in keeping, they discourage new building and increase land costs for the areas that are ready for construction. Even the plans for subway, surface and bus lines affect the housing of the people. If they are planned to serve new housing, they tend to spread the population and reduce congestion. And still other phases of city planning affect the housing of the people, particularly zoning, which, if reasonable, safeguards the investment of the small householder and, through stimulating home ownership,

encourages a pride in the home which assures its sanitary and safe maintenance.

BERNARD J. NEWMAN

Managing Director, Philadelphia Housing Association.

THE CLIFF DWELLERS OF KANSAS CITY

Not long ago W. J. Dixon, Public Health Engineer and Housing Expert of the Kansas City Consumers' League, publicly asked the question, "Are we reverting to a nation of Cliff Dwellers?" After citing the figures made public by the U. S. Bureau of Labor showing the increasing trend toward apartment house dwelling throughout the United States, Mr. Dixon proceeds to analyze the situation in his own city, and points out that there is a definite trend in Kansas City toward apartment dwellings—that whole districts have been taken over by this type of building. He gives figures to show that in the year 1921 70.1% of all the new dwelling construction in Kansas City was in 1-family dwellings; that 1.7% was in 2-family dwellings and but 28.2% in multiple-dwelling or apartments. Whereas, 7 years later in 1928, the figures showed that of all new dwelling accommodations provided for, only 48.8% was in 1-family dwellings, 4% in 2-family dwellings and 47.2% in multiple-dwellings or apartment houses.

Commenting on this trend which he admits is a national one, but which the people of Kansas City rightly recognize as dangerous to the well being of their community, he says:

The apartment-house type of living is opposed by many on the ground that it is not conducive to civic and social welfare, but the idea of economical housing is not to be denied. It is true that Kansas City is burdened with objectionable apartments built before the establishment of an adequate and modern building code, yet there is a place for the superior Garden type, built on sound structural principles and which provides a maximum of light and air with plenty of open space around the building.

Mr. Dixon points out that in other parts of the country steps have been taken to off-set these tendencies and to produce structures of improved type, which share the advantages of the private home with the economies and convenience of living of the multiple dwelling, and strongly urges the enactment of a building code which will prevent the evils of land congestion in the cities of the future.

THE NEGRO COMING INTO HIS OWN

Following the success of those splendid model tenements, the Paul Laurence Dunbar Apartments in New York made possible by the sup-

port of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.—a new, equally fine group of apartments for the better element of the negro population is now nearing completion in Chicago, as a result of the public spirit and intelligent interest in the negro race of Julius Rosenwald, who for years has been one of the leaders in the movement for bettering the condition of the negro in this country.

Associating with himself a group of Chicago financiers Mr. Rosenwald, after many years study of the subject, some months ago started the construction of a group of new modern apartment houses occupying an entire city block on the south side of Chicago, housing 417 negro families.

The Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments, as they are called, are located on the block from Michigan to Wabash Avenue extending from 46th to 47th Street on Chicago's South Side. They are in the heart of what was formerly one of the city's best residential districts, still occupied by the mansions of the well to do, which were invaded by hordes of negro families lured to the North during the War, and after, by the shortage of labor in the North and by the fabulous wages that were then offered. Here they crowded into these old mansions, often doubling up and living two families in a single apartment in buildings that were not suited for such occupancy, and with the natural consequence of destroying the neighborhood for any other purpose than a negro residential district. It is not strange that under these conditions rents soon began to skyrocket, that room overcrowding became great and brought with it a host of evils in its train.

Heretofore in this country there have been very few new apartments built commercially for negro tenants; the negro has had to generally content himself with the cast-off housing accommodations of his white neighbor. This situation is not peculiar to Chicago but is to be found in all American cities. As long as 15 years ago Julius Rosenwald, conscious of these conditions, contemplated a housing demonstration in Chicago, with particular reference to providing decent housing for the negroes in that city. Land was even actually purchased and plans drawn for an attractive apartment building; but after careful estimates of the cost of the project, it was found that the financial status of the colored people of Chicago was not high enough at that time to enable them to pay the rents that would have been necessary to secure a fair return on the investment.

With the changed economic condition of the colored people that has come about in recent years it seemed to Mr. Rosenwald that the time was ripe for the kind of housing demonstration that he has had in mind all these years. Consequently, a Committee of business men was

formed to study the condition of the colored people in Chicago and a survey of the higher income group among that race was made under the direction of the University of Chicago. This showed a need of apartments for colored people, especially of apartments of 3, 4 and 5 rooms. As a result of this study Mr. Rosenwald determined to go ahead with his project and after careful consideration of various sites, the present site was selected.

On this site, which is admirably situated, a Garden Apartment is now nearing completion. It is 5 stories in height, covers less than 40% of the 6 acres of land involved and when it is finished will provide accommodations for 417 families with a total of 1641 rooms. The majority of the apartments are, wisely, of 4-rooms. The apartments are modern in every respect, in fact may be said to represent the last word in comforts and even luxuries in apartment house living. All apartments are centrally heated from a central oil burning heating system. Every apartment is furnished with an electric refrigerator and with combination tub and shower bath. The apartments are being attractively decorated.

In the center of the block is a large central garden covering over 3 acres of land in which good sized trees and many shrubs have already been planted. There will be a playground for the smaller children in the garden and a sun room on the roof where persons especially needing it can take the sun cure. A modern nursery will be conducted in the building directed by competent persons. The building is fire-proof and the whole project will cost over 3 million dollars.

Rents, as was to be expected, are somewhat high. The 3-room apartments which consist of living room, kitchen, bedroom and bath, range from \$50 to \$54 a month, which is an average of \$17 to \$18 per room. The 4-room apartments, containing 2 bedrooms, rent from \$58 to \$72 a month, which is an average of \$14.50 to \$18 a room. The 5-room apartments, with 3 bedrooms, rent from \$68 to \$80, or an average of \$13.60 to \$16 a room per month. The standard of living in the new apartments is summed up as follows in an attractive leaflet issued by the company:

HERE YOU'LL GET MORE THAN JUST A FLAT

A New, Fireproof, Modern Building With A Beautiful Garden. All Outside Rooms Assuring Good Light, Air and View. Built-in Bath And Shower—Pedestal Lavatory—Sloan Flush Valves. Marble Bath Floors and Base. Selected Tenants—Wholesome Surroundings. Kitchens That Make Cooking a Real Joy—Electric Refrigeration—Built-in Cabinets—Combination Sink and Laundry Tub—Sanitary Garbage Receptacle Package Conveyor—White Enameled Gas Range. Playground For Children—Day Nursery School. Storage Space In

Basement—Laundry Gas-Dryer. Oil Heat—Ample Hot Water—Good Maintenance. Excellent Shopping, Transportation and Garage Facilities.

Although the apartments are not yet finished there is a constant stream of well-dressed, intelligent, respectable, colored families visiting them all day long to look them over and consider living there when they are finished.

Mr. Rosenwald's purpose in building these buildings is not what perhaps some people may have expected, the launching of another great charitable endeavor. No such thought was in Mr. Rosenwald's mind. While it has naturally been his desire to provide better living accommodations for several hundred negro families, while that result naturally would be gratifying to him and his associates, he has far more in view than this. What he hopes from this enterprise is a demonstration that by the methods employed in building these houses, that is by large scale mass operation, it is possible to build attractive, modern, healthful houses, which can be offered at a moderate rental within the purchase price of the people for whom the accommodations are intended, and that this can be done on an economic basis which will give a business return on the money invested, viz., 6% or better.

It is to be hoped that all of Mr. Rosenwald's intentions in this regard will be fully realized in this splendid new group of buildings, which promises to be a credit not only to him but to the city of Chicago.

THE CRUDE AMATEUR IN HOUSING

ROOM OCCUPANCY IN DETROIT

The cause of Housing at the present time is suffering from intrusion into the housing field of groups of people in different parts of the country who, with little or no knowledge of the subject, assume to lead others in their community into the right paths in the field of housing reform. A striking illustration of this is found in a recent article by Oliver W. Sundahl of the Michigan Housing Association, commenting on the result of a study made by the Detroit Board of Health with the assistance of the Board of Education of that city, to determine the extent of room occupancy throughout the entire city of Detroit, as the result of a school census made by the Board of Education.

This work was undertaken very largely at the earnest urging of Mrs. Edith Elmer Wood, on behalf of the American Association of University Women, who rightly appreciated the importance of know-

ing the facts with regard to room occupancy. A real service was rendered in having such a survey made.

It is to be regretted, however, that those to whom the citizens of Detroit look for leadership in housing should have made such egregious comment upon the results of this survey; for, nothing but misunderstanding can result from that kind of leadership. Mr. Sundahl in his article says:

IN THIS COUNTRY 1 PERSON PER ROOM IS CONSIDERED AS THE MAXIMUM OF TOLERANCE OR CROWDING; ALL OVER ONE IS CONSIDERED AS OVERCROWDED OR CONGESTED.

He then proceeds to apply this definition to the results of the school census taken in Detroit, and reaches the conclusion that "over-crowding was found in 53 of Detroit's 588 zones".

Could there possibly be more stupid treatment of a great problem? All that one needs to do to see the utter folly of this kind of statement is to picture to oneself the ordinary method of living of all of the people—not only of this country but of all civilized countries. Under Mr. Sundahl's definition of "over-crowding" it would be wrong for a man and wife to sleep in the same room, no matter what the size of the room is; or for 2 children no matter what their age to sleep in the same room, even though the room might be 12 feet in one dimension and 15 feet in another. What utter nonsense!

Having set up this man of straw in the form of this preposterous definition of what constitutes room-overcrowding, Mr. Sundahl then proceeds to find that "over-crowding" exists in 53 of the school census zones of Detroit because "the total number of rooms in these zones numbered 98,282 and the population 111,835, or 1.136 persons per room". What a grand way to make statistics! The veriest tyro in the art of statistics knows better than that.

Mr. Sundahl similarly reaches the conclusion—how he reaches it is not disclosed—that "crowded" conditions exist in 88 additional zones because there are in them 183,559 rooms with a population of 174,721; which, by the same delightful principle of averages, gives an average of .951 persons per room. Just why a little less than one person per room should be deemed a "crowded" condition is not disclosed!

The Michigan Housing Association is said to be engaged in correlating the information derived from what they term these "indices of congestion" with various social problems and health conditions such as sanitation, communicable diseases, infant and general mortality,

school truancy, delinquency and crime, direct distribution of charity to individuals and distribution of play space.

We sincerely hope that the citizens of Detroit will not be influenced to any action by such crude, misleading and amateurish conclusions as the Michigan Housing Association has presented.

We suggest to the officers and members of that organization that before they attempt further to lead the cause of housing in Detroit they go to school and learn something about the fundamentals of the housing problem.

THE SELLING OF INDULGENCES

IN PORTLAND, OREGON

The City of Portland, Oregon, evidently needs a new Martin Luther to wage a Holy War against the selling of indulgences. If one can judge from certain facts presented at a hearing before the City Council of that city some months ago, in which a hundred or more citizens appeared to protest against the preposterous administration of the Housing Code in that city.

Upon that occasion facts were presented which showed how little the average city government is to be entrusted with the making and enforcing of housing laws. The principle of local self government, which to so many Americans has become a fetish, would certainly seem not to stand up under a close examination of how it works in practice, if one can judge by the facts presented upon this occasion.

Tracing the history of the Portland Housing Code with regard to one aspect of it, viz., the minimum requirement for rear yards for dwellings and apartment houses, it was shown that when this Code was enacted in 1919, the minimum size rear yard then required for a 3-story building on an interior lot was 25 feet. The year following this was reduced to 18 feet; 7 years later it was reduced to 12 feet; and it is now proposed to reduce it to 10 feet.

With regard to 6-story apartment houses on interior lots the Housing Code when originally enacted, in 1919, provided for rear yards 40 feet in depth—which, if there had been a similar rear yard at the rear of the abutting lot would have given proper open space between 6-story buildings. One year later this minimum standard of 40 feet was reduced to 27 feet; 7 years later it was reduced to 15 feet; it is now proposed to reduce it to 13 feet.

When, however, it comes to a consideration of the way in which local Home Rule has functioned with regard to the Housing Code the situation takes on a really sinister significance.

In the city of Portland they have the charming custom of allowing the local authorities to issue so-called "special permits", relaxing the laws or setting them aside in special cases passed as "emergency" measures voted by the City Council.

In the year from April 1920 to 1921, 9 such "special permits" were issued. The next year 19 were issued, the following year 95. In the year from December 1923 to 1924, 127 "special permits" were issued; in the year following 130; and in the year from December 1926 to 1927 the amazing number of 167 such permits were issued.

As if this were not enough, it would seem as if the local authorities in the city of Portland were determined that the citizens of that community should have none of the protection afforded by housing laws, such as the citizens of more enlightened communities enjoy.

In addition to these "special permits" it appears that the City Council has the unique practice of passing "special ordinances" setting aside the Housing Code with regard to particular buildings. According to actual count from the records in the period from April 1, 1920 to April 1, 1928, 694 "special ordinances" were enacted by the City Council, permitting the building of individual structures that were in violation of the Portland Housing Code in some important respect.

172 such special ordinances let down the laws with regard to light and ventilation, 451 let down the laws with regard to the already inadequate requirements for yards and courts; 142 let down the restrictions against the occupancy of cellar apartments, and 177 relaxed the law with regard to fire protection.

The West loves to talk about the "effete East". It is evident that the West had better look to its own house. If President Hoover's Commission on Law Observance desires to learn why the American people are not obeying the Prohibition Laws they might find in a study of the enforcement of the Housing Code in Portland facts that would throw a flood of light upon the present temper and attitude of the American people toward law enforcement.

We fear that many of our people are in favor of the law being enforced against the other fellow, and are quite willing to obey laws which do not prevent them from doing the things they want to do, but that when it comes to laws that conflict with their own interests or desires, we are essentially a lawless people.

Apparently the people of Portland are.

THE AIMS OF A LOCAL HOUSING ORGANIZATION

PITTSBURGH

The aims and purpose of a local housing movement were admirably expressed by John Ihlder, the Executive Director of the recently organized Pittsburgh Housing Association, at a public meeting called by that body a few months ago to stimulate local interest in their work, and have wider application than to that one community.

Speaking of the aims of this Association, Mr. Ihlder said:

Its purpose is to make a contribution to the art of living together and working together, to aid in seeking ways to control the city's destiny so that *all* its people may participate in a sustained period of prosperity and happiness. It is essentially an organization which seeks to co-operate with others in achieving a common purpose.

This common purpose is to raise the standard of living in Pittsburgh by setting a definite line below which no dwelling in the city will be allowed to fall. That line is determined by the answer to the question, "Is this a proper dwelling in which to rear the future citizens and workers of Pittsburgh? Does it give the children of today a fair chance to become self-respecting, self-supporting men and women?"

The Housing Association will doubtless be interested in more than this, but this is its chief objective.

Housing has many phases and as the work of the Association grows it will wish to enlist the interest and assistance of many groups. There will be questions of law and law enforcement, of economies in construction and management, of improvements in house plans and design. There will be questions in the general field of economics where Pittsburgh students and practical business men may pool their knowledge and experience to the city's advantage.

For, the improvement of housing conditions, if it is to go far enough to meet the need adequately, must be based on sound economics. Philanthropic housing, housing with a deficit, can never serve more than a favored few. Its great contribution lies not in what it does for its tenants, but in demonstration of methods and their results that may be given general application.

There is probably no subject in the social field which contains so much emotion as housing. It deals with the family, the essential unit of society. It deals with children, with whom lies all the future.

Discussing the problem of Government-aided housing, contrasting the situation in England with that which exists in Pittsburgh, Mr. Ihlder pointed out that:

England learned how great is the emotional phase of housing when, at the close of the world war, its soldiers who had fought for their homes, returned to find there were no homes for them. In order to avoid worse troubles, England embarked upon a great programme of government-built dwellings, though it knew that what it was doing was unsound economically.

We were fortunate in that we had only two years of war with its check on building, as against England's four years. We again were

fortunate in that having built our cities to care for a great stream of immigration, the war and later the quota law cut that stream to a dribble. Because of this we had housing accommodations, of a sort, to care for our normal increase of population.

So we were able to go through the crisis without a great government house-building programme. We were able to continue our dependence upon private enterprise. We must recognize, however, that private enterprise first met the needs of the well-to-do. It did this so well that in many cities we are now over-built in houses costing \$8,000 and up. Now, private enterprise, in order to keep its organization going, is looking for new work, is becoming interested in less expensive dwellings. Every time \$500 or \$1000 is cut from the price of a house, a new market is opened. Gradually we are approaching the condition of before the war when there was contact between new houses and the poorer old houses and when, in consequence, there was a steady progression of tenants from bad to fair to good to better dwellings.

THE MENACE OF THE SLUM

Discussing slums and their potential danger to the community, Mr. Ihlder said:

Slums and slum dwellings are a greater menace to America today than they were before the war. The immigration quota, the fact that today more than half our population lives in cities and towns, mean that the majority of Americans from now on, the majority of our citizens and workers, will be born and reared in our cities. The future population of Pittsburgh will be a Pittsburgh product. It is up to us to see that it is good.

There is another phase of this that has escaped attention. We have had slum dwellings in the past, and they have caused us concern. But we have not had a slum population. Most of the occupants of our poorest housing were immigrants to whom that housing was a mere stopping place. So, the character of a district changed almost from decade to decade, first Irish, then German, then Italian, then Jewish; each nationality staying only long enough to establish itself and then pushing on to something better.

Today that immigrant stream has been so diminished that it seems likely to settle in stagnant pools. Unless we get rid of our slum dwellings we are sure to create a new thing in America—a slum population.

Mr. Ihlder, discussing the methods of work that may be expected to bring success points out that the fact must be faced that there are always people who will accept the cheapest thing that is offered, no matter how poor it is, no matter how expensive it will prove in the long run; and that, therefore, in housing it is necessary to see to it that the poorest accommodations offered are at least a fit place in which to live.

With his wide experience Mr. Ihlder has naturally no illusions as to the nature of the task that confronts the people of Pittsburgh, and frankly points out to them that the job that they have undertaken

is a long one and that they are dealing not only with property values of great magnitude but also with human beings, many of whom are set in their ways.

The Pittsburgh group have very wisely decided not to make more surveys. Mr. Ihlder very appropriately points out that they have had enough surveys—a situation which applies to other cities in the country as well as to other fields of activity.

Summing up their task Mr. Ihlder said:

We expect to work with, not against, the great economic and social currents. We recognize the power of self-interest. Our task is to aid in creating a more enlightened self-interest. We accept the propositions that America is a land of high living-standards, that prosperity is largely based upon the purchasing power of the mass of the people, that a business guided by a high standard of practice is both more sound and more satisfying.

But this means effort, continued effort. It required effort to move the railroad tracks from Liberty Avenue, though both the railroad and the city profited by it. So all raising of standards requires effort; for, it means overcoming inertia, changing established customs, interfering with a familiar routine. But lack of effort means sliding downward. For, of course, we don't stand still.

The Housing Association is concerned with the well-being of the people of Pittsburgh. Upon the children of Pittsburgh our industries must depend for their future workers. The children of the Pittsburghs of America will determine the future policies of America.

I have intimated that better housing is primarily a matter of law and law enforcement. But beyond that it is a matter of public opinion. If the people of Pittsburgh wish to have housing conditions improved, if they wish that every child in Pittsburgh shall have a fair chance to become a self-respecting, self-supporting citizen, and if they wish it hard enough to stand back of public officials who are enforcing the law, to honor and commend owners who maintain their properties in good condition, then the days of bad housing in Pittsburgh are numbered.

In a statement issued at the time of this organizing meeting, it was pointed out that effort for housing reform in Pittsburgh extended back over a period of 35 years; that organized effort for better housing extended back at least 18 years; that during that time, as in other cities, there have been many committees and various agencies covering many phases of housing from regulation to building projects; and that one of the purposes of the Pittsburgh Housing Association was to consolidate and give organic expression to these scattered and at times overlapping efforts.

As was to have been expected, there have been substantial results from all these various forms of effort. Housing laws and regulations have been enacted, city bureaus or divisions of city departments with responsibility for housing in the form of building inspection, housing

and sanitary inspection, plumbing and house drainage, are all functioning; anyone who inspects the poorer sections of the city finds constant evidence of their work; the recent movements for zoning and city planning in Pittsburgh have been vital and significant and have a very important relation to housing betterment.

Notwithstanding all this effort, there is a general feeling in the community that sufficient progress in housing betterment has not been made and that the time has come when more practical results should be expected.

METHODS TO BE EMPLOYED

Discussing methods a number of practical questions were put to those attending the Conference as to the methods which the Pittsburgh Housing Association should employ in seeking to bring about changed conditions. It was stated that

The improvement of housing is a task of such size and difficulty that it must be undertaken on a comparatively large scale and with the cooperation of other agencies interested. For illustration; a co-operative agency having called the Association's attention to a particular dwelling, the Association will investigate neighboring dwellings to learn whether similar conditions exist in them, and then seek remedies which will apply to all.

Recognizing the futility of working on a single dwelling alone, the necessity of a more wholesale method, there is then the question whether the Association, with its limited resources should begin by investigating scattered groups of dwellings in all parts of the city, as its attention is called to them, or should begin by confining its work to one, two or three selected areas in the city and seek to secure a fairly thorough knowledge and record of their condition, before extending to other areas.

If the second policy is the wiser, which areas should be selected?

The Association asks what methods will promote the most effective cooperation between the Housing Association and other agencies? What adverse housing conditions are: a. Most general; b. Most injurious to health and social well-being; c. Most difficult to deal with?

From all of which it will be seen that Pittsburgh is grappling with its housing problem in man-fashion.

We commend the methods employed in Pittsburgh to Detroit and other cities that are taking up effort in this field.

SECOND MORTGAGES

Mr. Reep's "Second Mortgages and Land Contracts in Real Estate Financing"* is a most practical and welcome production.

* "Second Mortgages and Land Contracts in Real Estate Financing" by Samuel N. Reep. Prentice, Hall, Inc., 70—5th Ave., N. Y. Price \$5.

The author with his background of scholarly training and practical experience in home financing, embodies in this book the results of field studies in many cities, and of detailed analysis of laws and other written material. As chairman of the mortgage and finance division of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, he has had unusual opportunities for personal contacts. For those whose first interest is in the bearing of second mortgages upon the problems of home ownership and housing this book is, in some ways, of heightened value because it is written primarily for men engaged in real estate financing and other lines that have a direct concern in the establishment of junior real estate mortgaging on a sounder and more satisfactory basis.

The author of this book holds that as laws controlling real estate financing have usually been drafted with first mortgages in mind, they are unduly restrictive to second mortgage financing. Interest charges for instance are limited to such a low rate by the usury laws of the various states, that second mortgages cannot be made with any profit. But, as there is a real need for the added financing provided for by second mortgages, second mortgages are made—laws or no laws—and will continue to be made and to be manipulated so as to avoid legal restrictions as much as possible. Experience has shown, he says, in the section of the book devoted to this question, that the stricter the laws or their enforcement the more expensive are the means of evasion, the more speculative the investment, and the higher the rates the borrowers must pay.

Under present laws it is not usually illegal for a *bona fide* holder of an obligation such as a second mortgage, to sell it at less than its face value, and the legitimately operated second mortgage companies in most states have had to confine their operations mainly to buying second mortgages at a discount, from real estate firms, contractors, and operative or speculative builders who have taken them in part payment for homes. Thus a second mortgage for \$1,000 bearing a 6% interest rate, and running for 2 years, may be bought for \$850. Such legitimate transactions are supplemented however, by a considerable number of dealings that are tainted with illegality.

The author's proposed remedy is to alter this situation by having profitable direct second mortgage financing made legitimate through removing or modifying the present hampering usury, foreclosure and redemption laws. This would allow lenders to take advantage of the present data on second mortgage risks by dealing directly with borrowers to whom they could extend credit on second mortgages with reasonable safety at a much lower cost than is now possible. This

would dissipate fears, increase knowledge of the situation, make more money available, and benefit lenders, builders and home owners.

After a clear presentation of this need for financing home owners and other purchasers of property above the amount now obtainable on first mortgages, the author takes up the legal and economic security afforded the holders of junior liens, and various problems connected with carrying on a second mortgage business. His discussions of appraisals, commissions and discounts, preparation of second mortgage and land contract papers, foreclosures of second mortgages, the cancellation of land contracts, the machinery for discounting second mortgages, and the organization of second mortgage and land contract companies, are eminently practical. Standard forms printed in the appendix show how mortgages can be drafted to avoid some of the many difficulties described in the main text. These are vital matters for those who want to improve or organize home financing facilities, either locally or on a broader scale.

He analyzes the question as to whether or not building and loan associations generally should take second mortgages, as is now done in Philadelphia, and describes sharp practices of various types which he believes would tend to disappear if legal rates of interest permitted for secondary financing were increased, and if various other statutory changes were made.

He concludes his text with a discussion of the future of second mortgage and land contract financing and a critical appraisal of the types of organization adapted for the business.

One important question of administration which is not treated fully is that of personal risk. A second mortgage on a home, as at present constituted, is often, from a practical point of view, better secured as a personal loan, based on the income, thrift and personal sense of responsibility of the borrower, than as a claim against the property. No matter how the documents are worded, the value of many a second mortgage depends on whether or not the borrower is able and willing to meet his payments. Many companies frankly recognize this fact and investigate the character, income, and family finances of the applicant, at least as carefully as his property. Many of the second mortgage companies which are in financial difficulties have not followed this practice.

Presumably with a desire to concentrate on his major topic, Mr. Reep discusses only briefly an important question which he is well qualified to treat in the light of some of his pioneer practical work. It is this: To what extent can the first mortgage be extended into the area now covered by the second mortgage or land contract, and thus

obviate the need for much of the junior financing that is now required? Is it so often necessary to have both first and second mortgages? What may be expected from first mortgages, covering a higher percentage of the value, which might include provision for higher amortization payments than is now customary? Or could first and second mortgage administration be more closely integrated? There is less expense in making one loan than two; one investigation of credit, not two; watching payments on one, rather than two mortgages.

Mr. Reep has made a solid contribution in his field, and his present indispensable volume has earned him the thanks of all those interested in the problem of home financing and its relation to home ownership and living standards.

JAMES S. TAYLOR
Division of Building and Housing,
U. S. Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

AN EPIC OF HOUSING

“THE BUILDING OF 12,000 HOUSES”*

Every American architect and every American town planner, as well as every student of housing conditions in America, will find it profitable to study closely the remarkable book entitled “The Building of 12,000 Houses” written by the Right Hon. Sir J. Tudor Walters, former Member of Parliament and associated with the Ministry of Health during the Addison regime.

This account of how a number of mining companies were joined together in a cooperative housing scheme, resulting in the building of 12,000 miners’ houses in the short period of 5 years in England, under adverse conditions, may well be characterized as an “epic of housing”.

In this attractive book with its 40 pages of text and 100 pages of Plates will be found compressed into the most compact method of statement the boiled-down experience of a number of practical men, actuated by the desire to build homes that would be of the highest type for bona fide working people applying to this all of the knowledge and advantages of modern industry, along with a specialized knowledge of housing.

In 1922, when as a result of a general election Sir Tudor Walters was not returned to Parliament, opportunity was taken of that fact by Lord Aberconway and a group of colliery owners in England to secure his services and to launch what is probably a unique enterprise, viz., a

* “The Building of 12,000 Houses” by the Rt. Hon. Sir J. Tudor Walters, Ernest Benn, Ltd. 154 Fleet Street, London, 142 p. Price 21 s. net.

cooperative effort on the part of 25 different collieries in providing modern, up-to-date and satisfactory housing accommodations for the workers in those collieries, without profit to the employers, without paternalism and without burden upon the taxpayers.

Summing up the results of this experience Lord Aberconway in his preface to this book says:

The Association has taught the public that State aid can be given to work of national importance on purely business lines without the help of subsidies at the expense of the taxpayer. It has taught that by cooperation on sound lines commercial firms can secure the best results at the lowest cost for the necessary undertakings supported by their joint credit. Finally, it has proved that the workers in our great industries can be housed and cared for on a generous even lavish scale by a charge on the industry in which they are engaged without involving any loss to those by whom the capital outlay is found or guaranteed.

That the result of such effort has been reflected in the prosperity of the industry involved is evidenced by Lord Aberconway's statement that—"It is not too much to say that these housing schemes have made all the difference between the stagnation of the coal trade in the areas above mentioned and a full and profitable output of coal commensurate with the capital invested in the new sinkings in these districts which now largely control the mining industry of the country."

Sir Tudor Walters in this book outlines every phase of the problem with which he was confronted and gives to employers of labor and to the public generally the benefit of this 5 years' experience in providing housing for a particular class of workers.

One of the great values of this book is to be found in the fact that it contains the carefully kept records of such work through a 5-year period and the conclusions that can be properly based upon them. After sketching the reasons which led to the formation of this unique cooperative scheme—a cooperative organization of employers for the benefit of their workers—he takes up some of the problems that confronted them, how they were solved, the method of organizing the building trade, the question of subsidies, prices and rents.

The types of site plans and house layouts, the materials used and why, the relative advantages of concrete, brick and steel construction, the interior arrangement of the houses and the conveniences furnished, with special relation to the peculiar needs of mining districts, the financing of the scheme and the cost through a 5-year period of houses of various price, the relations of lessees and tenants and the details of the system under which the scheme is carried out, are all described.

This text occupies 40 pages of the book; the remaining 100 pages are given up to a series of Plates of elevations and house plans of the

various houses in the different towns and villages in which they were built.

The whole book is an inspiration to housing workers in America and should be of the greatest value to employers of labor in America who may be contemplating similar work for the better housing of their employees.

THE AMERICAN BLIGHT ON PARIS

At last it has come. The opening wedge has been driven and Paris is to have an American skyscraper, if one can believe recent dispatches from that city.

If the French people had not already many reasons for hating Americans, they will acquire new ones when this 18-story gigantic apartment house is completed and the people of Paris see what a horrible blight it is upon their community—towering up above all neighboring buildings, destroying the scale of the beautiful Bois de Boulogne and of Longchamps, bringing into Paris everything that is objectionable in American life. Who wants whole rows of 18-story skyscrapers in charming St. Cloud, overlooking the Seine and thrusting their hideous bulk into the landscape as one drives along the Bois or goes to the races at Longchamps?

Many similar attempts have been made in the past by architects and speculators who have cast envious eyes on their American brothers' opportunities to overbuild the land, but who have heretofore been prevented from doing so by the French laws and by public sentiment in Paris. It looks, however, as if the walls had begun to crumble. For, it is announced that the Government has granted a "special dispensation" to permit these 4 gigantic 18-story apartment houses to be erected notwithstanding the fact that under the French law, 8 stories is the maximum height to which such buildings may be built in the city of Paris.

The justification for this action is said to be found in the shortage of apartments in Paris. No one contends, however, that there are not numerous building sites on which apartment houses can be erected without constructing these monstrosities. No one has any quarrel with the building of apartment houses in Paris, which is essentially an apartment house city, but it is building these monstrosities to this excessive height that is so objectionable.

Facing the River Seine overlooking the Bois de Boulogne and the Longchamps race course a group of 4 gigantic apartment houses, 16 stories in height, with superimposed upon them a so-called pent-

house, 2 stories high, is to be erected immediately adjoining the Pont St. Cloud.

The building, which is really to be 4 buildings, will offer every modern convenience known in America. The apartments will be arranged in groups of 2, 3 and 4 rooms with a bath for each bedroom. There will be 160 rooms on each floor and a total of 2560 rooms in the building. The so-called penthouses are being laid out on the grand scale and will include individual roof gardens. Most of the apartments on the Bois de Boulogne side will have sun porches; each suite of rooms will have wood-burning fire places. Eleven modern automatic elevators will serve the tenants at the same high speed that is customary in New York.

The new apartments, to be known as *Les Accacias*, will be accessible to the heart of the business and shopping center of Paris by boats on the Seine, by buses and by a 15-minute train service to the Gare St. Lazare. The apartments will rent at approximately \$260 per room per year. There will be a central heating plant, all wires will be concealed—something that is unusual in France—and the buildings will contain shops, swimming pools, tennis courts and a private park. Because of differences in grade and the fact that the building will have frontages on 3 streets it is possible to arrange for garages for the convenience of the tenants at the rear of the building above the street level. M. Citroen, the Henry Ford of France, is said to be financially interested in the project.

A New York firm of architects is responsible for the design of the building which, apparently, corresponds closely with the usual Riverside Drive apartment house.

It would almost seem as if the French people had never heard of the story of the goose that laid the golden egg. It is perfectly true that if this building is permitted to be built, it will lay golden eggs for those favored few in Paris who have been permitted to do something which their fellow citizens are forbidden to do—viz.: overload the land beyond its proper bearing capacity.

If the authorities are not careful they will soon be in the position of the man who killed the goose that laid the golden egg; for, if they keep on Americanizing Paris much further, they will find that the American people will cease to come to Paris—in fact many of them are now doing so. The more intelligent Americans are avoiding Paris as they would the plague, for there is no longer any point in leaving New York and crossing 3,000 miles of ocean merely to find another New York upon arrival. Who wants the same things in France that he has in New York?

The French people should be alert and on guard against further Americanization of Paris and should be advised that the rowdy vulgar crowd of Americans that now swarm through Paris in the Summer time are not the kind of Americans that France will find it advantageous to encourage.

New York would like to get rid of its horrible massive skyscrapers—the very same kind of buildings that it is now proposed to build in Paris. They are the curse of New York. They are largely responsible for New York's insoluble traffic problems; they shut out light and air; they destroy the amenities of civilization.

It is horrible for a lover of Paris to contemplate their erection in that once charming city.

TOWN PLANNING A DEAD LETTER IN FRANCE

According to M. Alfred Agache, the distinguished town planner, the French Town Planning Law of 1919 has become a dead letter. It will be recalled that under this Act the duty of preparing plans for future development is laid upon the larger towns in France. M. Agache calls attention to the fact that the plans which he, himself, has prepared for Greater Paris, for Rheims and Dunkirk have none of them been carried out, due to what he describes as “juristic obstructions of the Conseil d’Etat”.

M. Agache expresses himself as fearing that the new Loucheur Housing Law, enacted a year ago, is going to be similarly ineffective and that it will do little to solve the peculiar difficulties of Paris, because it proposes to tackle the problem of housing quite independently of the question of distribution of the population.

To M. Agache, France unfortunately still lacks the modern civic sense and her tenacious individualism has the effect of accentuating the national inaptitude for collective effort and organization.

It is of interest to note that M. Agache's views with regard to the Loucheur law are shared by the German town planner Dr. Albert Heymann who finds the financial provisions of that law fundamentally unsound in the light of German experience and considers that it will prove unworkable and ineffective.

PLANNING THE PARIS REGION

Under a decree of March 24th, 1928, an organization has been formed for the Greater Paris Region, which includes the Departments of the Seine, Seine-et-Oise and Seine-et-Marne. In contrast to the London Regional Planning Committee and the Committee on Regional

Plan of New York and Its Environs, the Paris Committee is composed almost entirely of public officials and all are appointed by the Central Government, with the exception that the Council General of the Seine is allowed to nominate one councillor and the other two Departments two members each.

This new Committee is attached to the Ministry of the Interior and consists of 39 members. The members include all the Prefects within the region, the Presidents of the Municipal Council of Paris and of the Council-General of the Seine, a number of mayors and officials of various government departments.

The Committee is divided into 5 sections for the study of the following problems:

1. Planning of the fortifications zone, of the second line forts, Zoning, execution of the act relating to town planning, and the control of building estates.
2. French and foreign legislation, dangerous, inconvenient and insanitary establishments, general and administrative police.
3. Departmental and commercial finance, movement of population.
4. Public services (transport, water, gas and electricity).
5. Constructions and dwellings.

Reporters have been appointed to each of these sections for a period of 5 years.

It is quite evident from this statement of the organization of the Committee that its functions are quite different from those of the Regional Planning Commission of London or the New York Regional Plan Committee, although covering some of the field occupied by those 2 bodies.

A BI-PRODUCT OF ZONING

THE CONTROL OF BILLBOARDS

When the Zoning movement first originated 15 years ago those responsible for it never conceived that it would bring with it a valuable bi-product in the means which it affords to control so-called billboard nuisances. But valuable as the direct effects of Zoning control and regulation have been, it is not an exaggeration to say that one of its chief values has been in this bi-product—a fact which the people of the country are only now beginning to wake up to.

Much water has gone over the dam with regard to this subject of bill-board control in the effort to remove what may be termed “aesthetic nuisances”, since the movement was started some years ago by such valiant crusaders as J. Horace MacFarland and a host of others.

THE REALTOR TO THE RESCUE

Probably the most hopeful sign that has been observed in recent years has been the fact that the organized realtors of the country, speaking through their National organization less than 4 years ago took up the question of the control of outdoor advertising. At the annual meeting of the National group of Realtors held in Detroit in June 1925, the Association stated its position in the following terms:

We recognize that the natural beauty of our country is a public heritage to be conserved. It is a community possession, and no individual and no corporation has the right to despoil the natural scenic beauty of the land for private profit.

We believe that with the growth of the movement for city planning and zoning as a means to direct the future development of American cities, stabilize their land values and preserve their aesthetic values for community living, we should give serious consideration to the problem of outdoor advertising as one phase of the whole zoning movement.

We hold that the indiscriminate use of sign boards today retards the development of desirable districts, and tends to destroy values in districts already built up, and that such sign boards have become an offense to the public generally. We hold further that the time has come when we should determine whether or not the character, location, extent and maintenance of sign boards cannot be so regulated and controlled as to give legitimate opportunity for necessary advertising without the continuance of the present harmful conditions.

At this meeting a resolution was adopted recommending to the various executives, both city and state, and to the various planning and zoning commissions throughout the country, that immediate study be made of this problem. At the same time the Association's Committee on City Planning and Zoning was instructed to make a thorough investigation of the whole subject of the possibility of regulation of billboards and their use.

Following this action, and after conferences with the various interests affected, a series of 11 proposals looking to the control of billboards and outdoor advertising, both voluntarily by advertisers and purchasers of advertised commodities, and, where necessary, by appropriate legislation, was drafted by the City Plan Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and submitted by the Executive Committee of that body to the 657 constituent member Boards of the Association for their consideration and discussion.

These recommendations were based on the general principle that outdoor advertising, while it has a legitimate place in modern economic life, should be so controlled as not to destroy values in the residential sections of cities, or lower the appearance of business streets or detract

from the general public heritage in the enjoyment of the view along country highways.

These proposals advocated the elimination of all advertising signs within the limits of all public highways and from all public property, and purchasers of advertised commodities were asked to join in securing the elimination of billboards from scenic highways. Billboard companies, which have themselves instituted a 5-year programme for the standardization of their industry, were also asked to cooperate by refraining from the placing of signs where their use detracted from the use of the section.

THE REALTORS' STANDARDS FOR BILLBOARDS

The following proposals for a series of definite standards for billboard use were placed before the realtors of the country at that time:

1. City billboards in the commercial or industrial districts may, under definite control be conceded a place in our business life.
2. The National Association of Real Estate Boards favors the elimination of all advertising signs within the limits of all public highways and on all public property except signs relating to the use of such public properties.
3. We disapprove of the use of overhanging signs on public thoroughfares, in business districts or elsewhere.
4. We recommend the elimination of all billboards as advertising signs in rural sections where they destroy the beauty of the scenery or the charm of the landscape, and to this end we ask the co-operation of all Realtors and of all billboard companies in refraining from placing billboards in such sections; we further recommend that if necessary, legislation be enacted by the various states to secure the elimination of billboards in such sections.
5. We urge the elimination of signs tacked to trees, or painted or pasted on telegraph poles, fences and the like, or, in rural districts, painted on rocks. The observance of this recommendation is particularly urged upon those who aspire to public office.
6. We favor the prohibition of signs and billboards where they create a traffic hazard.
7. No "for sale" sign more than twelve square feet in area should be placed by a Realtor upon a lot in a residential subdivision.
8. No such sign more than fifty square feet in area should be placed by a Realtor in an industrial subdivision.
9. No such sign more than 20 square feet in area should be placed by a Realtor on a business building.
10. No canvas sign of any kind shall be used by a Realtor either for indoor or outdoor advertising.
11. No sign should be erected by a Realtor on any property not owned by the Realtor or of which he is not the authorized agent.

Following this action by this great National body, local real estate boards in different parts of the country have passed resolutions and adopted standards for the control of billboard advertising in their states. Among the states taking the lead in this direction have been Massachusetts, New Jersey and Tennessee.

The most interesting proposals with regard to this whole subject that have been raised at any time have come from the state of Massa-

chusetts, which has been a pioneer in devising novel methods of controlling this evil, even having gone to the extent of amending the Constitution of that state by giving the state the right to regulate all advertising which comes within public view.

The validity of such requirements enacted even under this Constitutional amendment has been challenged by the billboard industry and the whole issue is now being thrashed out in the Massachusetts courts.

ZONING A STRIP ALONG THE STATE HIGHWAYS

The most recent proposal with regard to the control of scenic beauties and of the highways of the country is that offered recently in the Massachusetts legislature. The people of that state propose to avail themselves of the Zoning powers which they enjoy, by zoning the state highways throughout the state for a distance of about 1600 miles in extent.

As described by Edward T. Hartman, Consultant to the State Division of Housing and Town Planning, the scheme is to have the Division of Planning lay down zone lines along all state highways not within the cities or towns that have already adopted zoning systems. These lines are to extend back 500 feet on both sides of the highways. Permits will then be required for all structures or for the use of premises, except for the growing and sale of natural products of the land, and for such accessory buildings as are customarily used on a farm, the administrative work to be largely under local control.

DESTROYING A CIVIC ASSET—BEAUTIFUL SCENERY

The movement in Massachusetts for the protection of its natural scenery has received considerable impetus from a series of addresses and writings in the public press by Walter Prichard Eaton. Mr. Eaton has been campaigning up and down the state, pointing out to the "practical business men" of that commonwealth that their scenic beauty is a civic and commercial asset, and that it is folly from the business man's point of view to allow these assets to be destroyed. He points out that no person will much longer care to motor along Massachusetts highways when they are confronted by billboards, "hot dog kennels" and "automobile slums".

He said recently:

We are, in a good many places, doing everything in our power to spoil everything that has made New England unique; to destroy our true civilization for the horrible rubber-stamp variety common to the rest of the country.

We are allowing fine old highways going through some of the most beautiful country in America to become so cluttered with ugly signs, cheap stands, and the general mess and squalor of a typical modern American highway, that the visitor might almost as well be going through the Jersey meadows as through the Vermont hills. * * *

Consider the Post Road from the Berkshires to Boston, or the turnpike from Boston to Portland, or almost any through highway dedicated in large measure to tourist traffic. Such roads run through lovely country. But what, actually are they today? They are motor slums. . . . The road from Boston to Portland is a dirty slum of more than a hundred miles. So is the Springfield-Boston road. So are many others. Property values have depreciated along them in many cases. . . . They represent the worst features of city life spewed out over the countryside. They are a serious detriment to the continued prosperity of New England as a summer resort because they are steadily destroying deeper and deeper into the country and the villages, the charm, the neatness, the ordered dignity and the beauty which was our priceless heritage. * * *

HOW TO ATTRACT THE TOURIST

The finest and most effective advertising New England could have would be the simple news story carried, as it would be, in every paper in the land, that there was a paved highway from Long Island to the Canadian border without an advertising sign or a cheap filling-station or a "hot dog kennel" upon it; but garages in the towns, neat, clean, reasonable hotels at reasonable intervals, attractive tea rooms in nice old houses, filling-stations, well-built and conducted by the oil companies at intervals, and, for the rest, the lovely old country left as it was. . . . You couldn't keep tourists off that road with a nest of machine guns.

COUNTRY ROADS ARE NOW "GASOLINE ALLEYS"

Speaking of this situation, which presumably is no different in Massachusetts from what it is in other states, Mr. Hartman said recently:

The Massachusetts highways which originally had perhaps as attractive natural beauty as any in the country have become since the arrival of the automobile little more than gasoline alleys. These ways are literally lined with filling stations and "hot dog" stands, every unit of which has on it or in its vicinity anywhere from 50 to 100 placards, posters and signs, and all the intermediate areas are plentifully sprinkled with bill boards.

He gives as an instance the fact that along the main way from Boston to North Attleboro, a distance of about 30 miles, there are 86 filling stations with 186 gasoline pumps, plus 5 garages and numerous "hot-dog" stands and roast duck shacks, with all the accompaniments that he has already referred to.

While the proposed measure was not favorably reported upon by the legislature but was passed on to the succeeding legislative session,

public sentiment of a very intense order and degree was manifested in support of these proposals. The only serious opposition raised to the proposal was the Home Rule issue, namely against centralized control.

A NATION-WIDE SITUATION

That the Massachusetts situation is not a local or isolated one, is evidenced by a letter received recently from Mr. Eaton, written from California, in which he states:

The Mohave Desert is full of filling stations and sign boards, the California coast between the highway and the Pacific beach is a litter of tin cans, signs, shacks, even oil wells. One sign on the desert spoils 20 miles of scenery.

Those who are interested in the terms of the proposed Massachusetts legislation will find them set forth in Bulletin No. 146 issued by the Massachusetts Forestry Association under date of January 16th.

This extension of the Zoning system to protect the natural scenery of the country for indefinite miles along the public highway is a most ingenious use of a great power. We believe such legislation, if once enacted, will be sustained by the courts.

We commend to the other states of the country the method proposed in Massachusetts for controlling this evil.

BEAUTY A CIVIC ASSET

SHALL IT BE CONTROLLED BY LAW?

How essential architectural beauty is to the attractiveness of our cities the average man in the street, in America at least, does not yet fully realize. Those of us who are interested both in housing and in town planning came to the conclusion some time ago that one might have a residential development, perfectly developed from the town planning point of view and the treatment of the site, but, if the houses that were placed upon it were not architecturally attractive, the scheme would be a failure. Similarly, there might be communities in which the architecture was of a high order but which were so badly planned that they had little interest for either town planners or housing reformers.

Both factors are essential to successful city building. There must be intelligent town planning, there must be architectural attractiveness. New emphasis is being placed upon the latter quality as an asset in city building by Charles H. Cheney, the California city planner, who is doing yeoman service in directing the attention of the country to the need of architectural beauty, and to the importance of controlling architectural development from the point of view of beauty.

It is, perhaps, not too much to say that at the present time Mr. Cheney is "a voice crying in the wilderness"; but he is only a few years ahead of his time. We are convinced that the control of architectural development from the point of view of beauty will be an accepted principle of American life before many years have elapsed.

Not long ago at the National City Planning Conference in Washington Mr. Cheney in striking fashion attempted to assess from his point of view the various cities of the country, as to what extent each measured up to his standards of what constituted beautiful building. He found that the city of Washington, which in this respect outranks most of the cities throughout the country, only achieved a rating of 25% and that 75% of its buildings are "ugly, depressing and absolutely out of place."

In New York, Mr. Cheney found the percentage even greater, only 12% of that city could be rated as good; the other 88% is bad. Philadelphia he found but 15% good—it is evident that he never ventured into the suburbs. Chicago he found but 8% good and San Francisco 11% good. That Mr. Cheney is no discriminator of persons was shown by the fact that he rated a town in his own state, Los Angeles, as 88% bad.

In reaching these ratings, Mr. Cheney said that while these were his personal views he believed that a frank and yet reasonably liberal and unbiased board of inquiry considering these cities from the point of view of architectural beauty would come to the same conclusions.

He even went so far as to express the opinion that within 50 years, more than 50% of our present buildings will have to be torn down because their exterior appearance ruins the street aspect.

Mr. Cheney's cure for the situation is Governmental control of architectural design. He finds already a new consciousness abroad in America demanding that "we no longer tolerate the careless builder, the cheap contractor, the ugly junk, the shoddy building, the off color and bad design which not only depreciate their neighbors so insidiously and unfairly, but worst of all blight the attractiveness and the value of what little good architecture there is, and break down those intangible values which are the mainstay of every city."

To him, control of architectural design and appearance are as definite and inseparable a part of a comprehensive city plan as is zoning or the major street plan, or unification of rail lines and terminals, rapid transit, parks, playgrounds and school systems, or the grouping of civic centers and public buildings—the recognized parts of a complete city plan.

How long it will be before our courts reach that state of mind, he does not pretend to prophecy; and in that he is a wise person. For, heretofore, the courts have shown themselves singularly unmindful of nuisances that affect the eye; although from time immemorial they have recognized that nuisances which affect the other senses—namely the ear and the nose—are subjects for municipal and state control, and come properly within the police power. It is only a question of a few years, we believe with Mr. Cheney, before the courts will recognize that nuisances that affect the eye are just as much to be dealt with and controlled by the community, as nuisances that affect the sense of hearing and the sense of smell.

Mr. Cheney's personal ratings of some of the best residential developments in the country, we feel sure will interest our readers.

Contrasting the ratings of the leading cities of the country that we have referred to with their very heavy proportion of bad architecture, he gives the following ratings to the country's leading residential developments: Roland Park, Baltimore, he rates at 95% good; the Sage Foundation Development at Forest Hills, Long Island, 95%; Shaker Heights, Cleveland, 80%; the Country Club District, Kansas City, 75%; St. Francis Wood, San Francisco, 85%; Palos Verdes Estates, Los Angeles, 95%; Santa Barbara, 40%; Nantucket (100 years old), 95%; Yorkship Village, Camden (a War Housing Industrial development), 95%.

When it comes to foreign cities, he finds Paris 95% good and Amsterdam 85%.

Mr. Cheney clearly recognizes that there are two methods of insuring what he calls "decency of design". One of these is to require by covenant in the deed or by declaration of restrictions the approval of all plans of new buildings in a tract being developed. The other—and what he considers the coming method, and which he thinks will undoubtedly be used on a much larger scale—is through municipal control of design and color by the police power through the establishment of architectural boards of review.

Success in controlling architectural design and color, thus securing harmony of design, in private residential developments by means of covenants and restrictions cannot be gainsaid. Those high class residential developments which we have already referred to, viz., Roland Park, Forest Hills, Shaker Heights, the Country Club District, and others have proved this conclusively and through a long period of time. Roland Park began this as far back as 1893, that is, 36 years ago, when it required plans for all buildings, fences and other struc-

tures and their color scheme, to be approved in advance by a committee of prominent architects.

Mr. Cheney recognizes that in order to secure high grade men who will serve as an Art Jury to pass upon such questions, they must be adequately compensated; and suggests a novel and ingenious scheme for accomplishing this, by endowing the enterprise, calling attention to the fact that when the Palos Verdes development in California was started in 1922 an endowment fund of \$300,000 was established, so that the income would be sufficient to employ the best architects in the development. He cites as of interest the method employed by the Art Jury in Montecito and says with regard to this:

The Montecito case is interesting because here the signatures of several hundred property owners are being sought to self-impose a complete scheme of protective restrictions in an established district which has \$7,000,000 of assessed values.

We are not able to follow Mr. Cheney in his suggestion that the control of such matters shall be regulated by municipal ordinance under the police power, and that the municipal authorities shall pass upon questions involving taste.

We think that here lies the weakness of his scheme. For, we have not yet so far advanced in our municipal administration as to free our ordinary government from graft, to say nothing of being able to achieve high standards of taste.

We shudder at the thought of what might happen to the architect of a beautiful, finely designed building notable for its absence of ornament but possessing beauty to a high degree through proportion, the right scale, proper fenestration and artistic and intelligent treatment of mass.

Were we to have politically-appointed censors of architectural taste, we can conceive that such a building might easily fail to pass the censor, who might feel that "it was too plain", that it was spoiling the rest of the neighborhood and insist upon its being loaded up with extraneous architectural ornament, so-called, and thus ruin its beauty.

The old motto "*de gustibus non disputandum*" still holds.

Browning expressed it perfectly when he said:

"Now, who shall arbitrate?
"Ten men love what I hate,
"Shun what I follow, slight what I receive,
"Ten who in eyes and ears match me."

It is because of these changing and conflicting standards of taste, we feel sure, that our courts have hitherto hesitated to sustain the exercise of the police power on the basis of aesthetic considerations.

That Mr. Cheney is right in his enunciation of the principle that beauty is a civic asset cannot be gainsaid. But that the method he suggests of insuring the beauty of our future cities is fraught with difficulties, can equally not be gainsaid.

PARKS BY COMPULSION

Not only is the "parking" problem one that is giving concern to public officials as well as to city planners, but city planners and realtors are also much concerned at the present time by what may be called the Park problem—in other words, how to secure an adequate supply of parks or other open spaces in the development of new communities, or new portions of existing communities, by a simple and inexpensive method.

There are some city planners who hold the view that, as a matter of law, sub-dividers should be compelled to devote a certain proportion of the land which they are sub-dividing for development purposes to be used in perpetuity as a public park or recreation space for the people of the neighborhood.

While they recognize that in all probability a requirement for "compulsory dedication" of such land would not run the gauntlet of the courts, it has seemed to them that a requirement for the allotment for park purposes of a certain portion of every bit of land subdivided might be incorporated in the Rules for Sub-division Control to be adopted by City Planning Commissions, and might be made a matter of barter between the local authorities and the sub-divider as a consideration for concessions sought in other directions.

Whether this method of beating the devil round the stump is a sound one or not, experience only will show. Suffice it to say that there has been a considerable amount of discussion recently among both city planners and realtors with regard to this proposal. The Massachusetts Association of Real Estate Boards in a resolution adopted a year ago came out for park dedication by sub-dividers. This action was taken in view of the conviction of that Board that the acquisition of necessary park space and the establishment of an adequate playground system are often hampered by the high cost of acquiring land for such use in growing cities where no provision is made at the time of platting the sub-division.

REALTORS FOR PARKS

Among the real estate boards and State Real Estate Associations who have formally adopted such resolutions may be mentioned the following:

The Massachusetts Association of Real Estate Boards, The New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, The Michigan Real Estate Association, The Phila-

delphia Real Estate Board, The Chicago Real Estate Board, The St. Louis Real Estate Exchange, The Washington, D. C., Real Estate Board, The Real Estate Board of Rochester, New York, The Real Estate Board of Newark, New Jersey, The Albany, New York, Realty Board, Inc., The Westchester County, New York, Realty Board, Inc., The Schenectady, New York, Real Estate Board, The Providence, Rhode Island, Real Estate Board, The Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Real Estate Board, The Putnam County, Florida, Real Estate Board The Dallas, Texas, Real Estate Board, The Medford, Oregon, Realty Board, The Laguna County, California, Realty Board, The N. Y. State Association of Real Estate Boards.

THE LAW OF COMPULSORY PARKS

An interesting compilation of state and municipal provision for park tracts in sub-divisions was made by Frederick Rex, Municipal Reference Librarian for the City of Chicago, a year ago at the request of the Committee of the Judiciary of the Chicago City Council.

This summary constitutes a report of all existing state laws or municipal ordinances which provide that subdivisions of large tracts of land shall not be accepted, approved or recorded by public officials, unless in such subdivisions reservations are made for public parks, playgrounds and similar recreational purposes. The report was made as a result of correspondence carried on with city officials in all cities in the United States having a population of over 100,000—some 75 in number—and in addition with officials in 125 cities having less than 100,000 inhabitants. Other facts and data were obtained from magazine articles, books, annual and special reports of park departments and similar recreational agencies, and from the proceedings of playground associations and similar organizations.

It is interesting and significant that in only one state, namely the State of Montana did the inquiry find a provision for the compulsory dedication of recreational or park areas as a condition of approval of sub-division plats. Such a compulsory provision either laid down by municipal ordinance or by the Regulations of the City Planning Commission was also found in the 5 cities of Akron and Dayton, Ohio; Kenosha, Wisconsin; Memphis and St. Paul.

On the other hand, the State of Ohio in its City Planning Law has a provision definitely providing that "the dedication of property for other than street purposes shall not be made a condition of the approval of the plat".

Mr. Rex's report indicates that land or property to be devoted to recreational purposes is being given outright in an increasing number of cases—due undoubtedly to the example of such practical real estate dealers as the late W. E. Harmon, who for many years has advocated this policy, with the statement that in his real estate developments he has always found that it was a paying thing to do.

Mr. Rex's report states that the Playground and Recreation Association of America lists 83 cities as reporting land or property do-

nated during the year 1925. In 51 cities the value of the property thus donated totalled the considerable sum of \$1,493,256.21.

RULE OF THUMB METHODS SCORED

There is some danger that city planners may advocate a rule-of-thumb method of securing the allotment of part of a new sub-division for park or recreation purposes. We already hear talk among the city planning group of a requirement to be embodied in the rules of City Planning Commissions, as one of the conditions of the approval of the plat, that 1 acre in every 10 of a sub-division shall be set aside for such public use. This is a very unfortunate way in which to handle the situation and one not at all in consonance with the principles of city planning. City planners should be on their guard against adopting any such methods.

A warning to this effect was sounded by C. C. Hieatt of Louisville, past President of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, in an address delivered by him before the National Recreation Congress not long ago. On this occasion Mr. Hieatt said:

A subdivider who has any regard for the future value of his property would hesitate before opening up an uncontrolled and unsupervised playground in the heart of it. There must be supervision or the gift will turn out to be a nuisance and depreciate values.

The subdivider who expects to set apart a portion of his tract for community use should do it in co-operation with some expert in recreation, so as to get the best possible advice as to where the playground and recreation centers should be located and how they ought to be set up, just as he employs engineers to make layouts and devise sewer systems or water systems.

With the development of fine residential areas the practice of setting apart a portion of the subdivision as a community park or center is becoming more and more general. Upkeep and supervision of such tracts may be safeguarded by putting ownership and administration in the hands of an association of the subdivision's home owners. But the subdivider who makes a gift of recreational lands to the people of his growing community cannot obligate himself indefinitely for its supervision and upkeep. Recreational leaders, who are urging extension of the practice of making park allotments should see to it that the city in which such land is situated is shown the wisdom of accepting that property and undertaking to supervise it, Mr. Hieatt brought out.

The "rule" sometimes laid down that one acre in every ten in a subdivision ought to be set aside for public use sounds all right in theory, but if you are subdividing a small tract of ten acres, you cannot cut out one acre and devote that to playgrounds without having, perhaps, a very illogical arrangement.

All things of that kind ought to be done under a comprehensive city plan that locates playgrounds and public spaces where they ought to be located, and then arrangements should be made with the developer to set aside a tract or make some contribution toward setting aside an appropriate location.

SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF PARK NEEDS OF A COMMUNITY

In place of the rule of thumb method which some city planners would like to see adopted, of compelling the dedication for park and recreation purposes of 1 acre out of every 10 acres included in a subdivision—in striking contrast to this rule-of-thumb method are the methods employed by George B. Ford of the Technical Advisory Corporation in determining scientifically the exact need for parks of various kinds in ratio to a given population, as worked out by him and his associates in the development of the Trenton City Plan and published in two documents “Public Parks and Playfield Programme 1927-1950” and its accompanying map entitled “Parks and Limits of Usefulness”.

Discussing this question in the *American City*, Mr. Ford says:

The accepted ideal standard is one acre of parks and playgrounds for each 100 inhabitants. A few cities, such as Washington, Kansas City, Minneapolis and Boston, have actually reached this ideal. Recreational specialists set as a practical working standard, one acre of park and play space for every 125 people.

It is found in practice that out of the total park and playground area in cities, one-third to two-fifths is actually in playfields, playgrounds and school play yards. Thus if the remaining two-thirds to three-fifths of the total area is in parks, the average working standard would be one net park-acre to 200 inhabitants.

Again, it is found that much, if not most, of the new park acreage must be outside of the built-up parts of the city; otherwise the new parks might be prohibitive in cost. As a matter of fact, in modern park systems, more than half of the park use by acreage is in park reservations outside of the built-up city. Thus, it is safe to say that 500 people and more per net park-acre inside of the built-up areas is a fair standard.

Mr. Ford makes a striking argument for the encouragement of one-family detached house development, as compared with a more concentrated scheme of housing in multiple-dwellings, by pointing out that the open one-family detached house districts use and actually need much less park acreage than the more congested parts of the city. He adds that:

It may be said that park use and need vary inversely with the density of population.

From which, he infers that from 500 to 1000 people per net park-acre is reasonable and logical for ordinary city conditions.

He then goes on to show, however, that there are other controlling factors in the situation, viz., the element of distance, and says that:

It is found in practice, however, that the maximum range of effectiveness of most parks is not over one mile, and the smaller the park the shorter its radius of usefulness. Even the larger city parks are of little use to people living much over a mile away.

Applying these principles to the study of the city of Trenton, which Mr. Ford has made, he finds that from 1/3 to 2/5ths of the total area inside the Trenton city limits lies outside any of the service belts about parks. From further studies he brings out the fact that in Trenton only about 60,000 people out of its 135,000 population are actually served by the existing parks; and concludes, therefore, that 100 additional acres of park are needed today and 47 more acres by 1950.

We regret that limitations of space do not permit us to reproduce here further details of Mr. Ford's intelligent and effective study of this subject. Every city planner and realtor will find it advantageous to secure copies of these reports.

A NEW ALLY FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

Evidence of the widespread interest that has been aroused in the City Planning movement will be found in resolutions adopted by a Committee on Surveys and Planning of the County Highway Officials' Division of the American Roadbuilders' Association. This body recommends the appointment of a Planning Commission for every county in the United States, to be composed of the governing body and highway engineer of the county with an Advisory Board of citizens where local conditions warrant.

In setting forth their reasons for these recommendations the Committee said:

In order that needed improvements may be planned to the best interest of the community, and with economy, each county should have a planning commission. Many of the wealthier counties—those having large revenue and rapidly growing communities—have such a commission. Reports indicate, however, that very few of the "average" counties—those having low assessed valuation or sparse population—have a well-defined system of planning of improvements. The county planning commission is needed just as badly by the counties of the latter class as the counties whose revenues permit great expenditures. In the majority of cases where valuation is low, the mileage of roads is out of proportion to the amount of moneys available for road improvement. It is here as much as anywhere else that improvements and expenditures must be carefully and intelligently planned, for both the present and the future, in order that the public may enjoy facilities which they might otherwise be denied.

While to many city planners it has seemed that the County is not the proper unit for Regional plan development, nevertheless one welcomes the advent into the city planning field of this important group.

STATE PLANNING ORGANIZATION

A Bulletin of the National City Planning Conference issued in 1927 stresses the importance of state organization for planning agencies, pointing out that progress nationally would be more rapid if the scattered efforts of different localities throughout the states could be combined and dove-tailed into a comprehensive scheme.

It cites as illustrative of the value of such state organizations the Massachusetts system with its Division of Housing and Town Planning and a State Consultant as its executive officer, and in Pennsylvania the Bureau of Municipalities of the State Department of the Interior, with its similar planning service.

The bulletin attributes to the existence of this form of organization the greater activity in these states than is found in many other states and says very pungently that:

It did not just happen that Massachusetts with its 95 planning commissions, Pennsylvania and New York with 34 each, Ohio with 25, California with 24, Indiana with 21, are the foremost planning states based on the number of local agencies, and that all of these states have fairly adequate legislation on both planning and zoning.

For these results the active help of state agencies is largely responsible. A federation of planning agencies with frequent conferences, both state-wide and regional, is considered an important step in the evolution of a state plan.

CITY PLANNING AND THE REALTOR

John Nolen, the distinguished city planner, addressing the Massachusetts Real Estate Board some months ago, discussed the question of city planning and its relation to real estate values in striking and effective fashion. He said on this occasion:

Some one has said that city planning is all bunk. I wonder if it is. The action of some towns and cities would seem to support that idea and yet city planning has to do with such every day topics as these: to relieve traffic congestion, to add to safety, to protect and to help the child, to increase and stabilize land values, to preserve the amenities of cities, and do away with nuisances, to improve public health and to lower the tax rate.

He added:

It becomes more and more apparent that successful city and regional planning depends not only on our grasp and understanding of problems and processes of physical planning, but also upon law and administration; upon sociology and economics, especially the rise and fall of land values, the influence of taxation upon property and persons and the relation of town planning to existing and potential land values.

Mr. Nolen cited the following eight respects in which those who have to do with real estate have a special interest in city and regional planning:

1. A plan to plot to. Until a city plan or a regional plan has been prepared it is not possible for an owner of suburban property to subdivide it with due regard to main thoroughfares, reservations for parks, proper zoning, etc., and unless this can be done the owner or operator cannot get the full value of the land. Many illustrations of this could be given. Especially notable developments like the Country Club district, Kansas City, developed by J. C. Nichols, Roland Park of Baltimore, St. Francis Wood of San Francisco, subdivided by Duncan MacDuffie, Myers Park development outside of Charlotte, N. C., and many others.

2. Time between home and work. The value of a property outside of a city does not depend so much upon distance as the time to reach it. This, in turn, depends upon a good thoroughfare plan worked out in connection with city and regional planning. For example, if the time from work to home could be reduced from thirty minutes to twenty minutes, there would be a corresponding increase in land values. There would also be an enlargement of the actual area available for development at city values.

3. Neighborhood requirements. Without broad city planning, subdivisions are apt to provide only streets and lots for homes, but under a good planning programme an area has a more comprehensive development and provides not only streets and house lots, but also sites for schools, areas for recreation, suitable locations for stores and shops and local amusements, parks and in many cases a community center. All of these features tend to increase the value of real estate and also to save the cost of providing such indispensable features later when the land costs would be higher.

4. Variety of development and higher standards. City planning and regional planning lead to greater variety in the uses of land. Such planning emphasizes natural characteristics of topography and other features. This is accomplished through a differentiated street plan, main streets—secondary streets—local streets, preservation of waterfronts or hillsides, the development of park areas, and all of the other factors which tend to make urban development interesting, pleasant and distinctive. A city or region developed in this way is more attractive to tourist visitors and increases their number. It also increases the number of permanent population.

5. Large residential subdivisions. It is only in areas that have been city planned or regionally planned that large residential subdivisions can be undertaken and put on the market with confidence. Many examples of this could be given in different parts of the country, especially in sections like Cape Cod, developed as pleasure and health resorts.

6. Higher values in the shopping district. All broad city planning contributes values to the central section of a city. It does so by making the business section more readily accessible, by the increase in the number of the population tributary to that section and by lessening congestion, thereby making the central city section safer and more convenient for shopping purposes.

7. Zoning. An essential part of any comprehensive planning of a city or region is zoning, or a system of differentiated building regulations. This means zoning property for its appropriate use by means of which it gets its highest value and is protected from the misuse of adjacent property. Also, regulating the height and area or bulk of buildings, which preserves values by making a district more agreeable to live in and providing adequately for light and air. According to Walter Stabler, Comptroller of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, which, I believe, is the largest lender of money on real estate, there is an annual loss of over a billion dollars due to the present methods by which cities grow, especially the depreciation of property due to a lack of thoroughfares, open spaces and zoning. Is not something wrong with our methods when the largest city, New York, has the most burdensome taxes, the greatest debt, the most costly subways, and with it all, the worst congestion?

8. A lower tax rate. City and regional planning are not a new means of spending money but a method of saving money to cities and regions, thus reducing the burden of taxes. This is accomplished by doing things at the right time

when they can be done at the least cost and with the greatest advantage. Also in doing things in the right way so that they do not have to be done over again, which would often double the cost.

Asking what is the weakest link in planning, Mr. Nolen finds it in the general lack of understanding by the public of what city planning is, its purposes, its methods, its advantages, its cost, its savings and its justification, and finds this lack of understanding due largely to lack of effective publicity.

DOES ZONING PAY?

George B. Ford in an address delivered before the Philadelphia Conference on City Government a year ago took occasion to point out how zoning reduces the cost of government and the great advantage it is on the mere economic side alone to all our cities.

In the course of this address he gave numerous instances where very considerable savings had been actually effected through zoning, bringing in evidence the testimony of public utility corporations such as the Worcester Gas Light Company which stated that because of the city plan adopted by that city it had actually cheapened the cost of gas service to the consumer, as the plan had made it possible to lay out and calculate their improvements carefully for many years ahead and know what they would have to deal with, instead of guessing at it. Similarly, telephone companies, sewer and water commissioners and other similar officials have all testified to the very distinct financial gains to be had where a city is zoned or a city plan developed.

Speaking generally, Mr. Ford finds that city planning and zoning mean cheaper public improvements.

Striking testimony to what Mr. Ford claims was afforded recently by a Report with regard to the city lighting system of the city of Lynn, Massachusetts. There, according to C. A. B. Halvorson, the street lighting system of the city has been designed by the General Electric Company's engineers to conform with its new zoning plan. By differentiating residence streets from business streets, and by knowing exactly what streets were to be residence streets and what streets were to be business streets, and to remain such, it has been possible to differentiate the whole system of lighting and to achieve results that could not otherwise have been achieved.

On residence streets, for example, which carry no through traffic a lower intensity of illumination is sufficient. On some of these streets 250-candle power lamps are used, while on the latter where they carry a considerable amount of through traffic, 600-candle power lamps are found necessary.

HOW CITY PLANNING PAYS

While the Philadelphia Regional Planning Federation has rendered a great service to the Region with which it is concerned by its two studies on By-Pass Highways and Park Reservations, we doubt if any service that it has rendered has exceeded that achieved by the talk given by its President Colonel Samuel P. Wetherill, Jr. before a meeting of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board some months ago.

What Colonel Wetherill said on that occasion to a group of hard-boiled practical realtors as to the value of city planning and how it pays, has a usefulness and significance far beyond the boundaries of the Philadelphia Region.

After pointing out that Regional planning is nothing more than city planning, but that city planning of the past was inadequate because it failed to recognize that the political limits of a city do not constitute its economic and social limits, Colonel Wetherill went on to say—referring to financial men in Philadelphia as he put it—who do not like to see a per capita debt of \$178.15 a year unless they can feel certain that the vast sum involved has been expended in the manner best calculated to obtain the maximum advantage—

They know, as do you, that science is a better guide in determining public policy than sentiment, and that prejudices give way before cold-blooded analysis of facts when these are so marshaled that they are easy to understand. I assert without fear of contradiction and with pleasure in challenging anyone to disprove the assertions that wise planning enhances values in many different ways. For example: It insures the profitable use of streets, it provides by-pass routes which naturally and normally classify the traffic which passes in and out of a given district into that class of traffic which it is most desirable for that district to receive. It mobilizes the buying power and keeps the wholesale traffic from obstructing the access of the retail buyer to the retail district. It speeds up the employment of the wholesalers' investment in transportation units by avoiding expensive delays. * * *

You may ask how Regional Planning can do all these things. I cite one simple expedient, though there are many others, to wit: The selection of a standard of paving and roadway-width for through arteries of traffic which is heavy enough to stand the traffic strain and hence will insure continuous satisfaction in the use of this main artery and thereby avoid the necessity of heavy paving on side streets which would otherwise be pressed into service and rapidly destroyed, unless they, too, had been paved at a prohibitive expense. The taxpayers of Philadelphia have not enough money to pave every street for a maximum load.
* * *

Regional Planning bases its judgment on determinable factors which are known to be the factors controlling the growth, progress and character of the area under consideration.

REGIONAL PLANNING ADVANCES IN THE PHILADELPHIA REGION

Two notable Reports issued by the Regional Planning Federation of the Philadelphia District, one of which is entitled "By-Pass Highways for Traffic Relief" have attracted widespread comment and attention, which has, by no means, been limited to the Philadelphia Region, but has extended its influence far outside its boundaries.

The Report in question can be obtained for 50 cents at the offices of the Philadelphia Regional Planning Association, 1700 Fox Building, Philadelphia. Seven (7) major thoroughfare routes are suggested in this Report, some of them designed primarily for commercial or express use with directness and convenience as the first object. Others are more scenic in character and intended for more leisurely use.

As indicative of the broad scheme upon which these studies are based and the implications that Regional Planning has when properly carried out, it is significant that one of these routes involves a trunk highway paralleling the sea but inland from it and connecting but not passing through the great industrial centers of the East Coast of the United States, extending from New York to Washington. Such is Route No. 1 of these seven By-Pass Routes suggested by the Federation.

They rightly say that such a route would prove a tremendous strategic and economic asset both in time of peace and time of war. This route is a link in a proposed Super-Highway paralleling the Atlantic Coast from Florida to Maine, already under contemplation and to be known as Washington Boulevard. It avoids built-up areas as much as possible and for the most part follows new rights of way. It contemplates an express roadway with few intersections and no direct grade crossings and with local roadways on either side and thus is a true Super-Highway. Direct connections are made from this highway into the various residential and industrial centers and chief points of interest along its route. As the Report says, it will be in effect the backbone of the highway system of the East Coast of the United States.

One of the other routes is a Scenic and Inter-Park Highway, taking a leisurely course around the more densely populated areas, generally following creek valleys and connecting up some of the existing and proposed parks of the Region with points of historic and scenic interest. This highway, which is virtually a parkway and designed primarily for pleasure traffic, begins at Wilmington and extends northward along the Brandywine Creek to its junction with Valley Creek, and then along Valley Creek across Chester Valley and along the wooded ridge north of Chester Valley to Valley Forge Park. It continues on further up

the Delaware River, one branch crosses into New Jersey to tie in with a highway suggested by the New York Regional Plan; while another branch continues down the river to Washington's Crossing, crosses the river at that point and extends easterly by Princeton to Somerville where it connects with local routes of that region.

The Report suggests no finality for every detail of the routes embodied in this document but rightly says that the suggestions and the report are preliminary to more detailed study and more intensive effort to be undertaken by the Federation working in co-operation with others.

MEADOW, FOREST AND STREAM

Another equally valuable Report concerns itself with the development of parkland, and is entitled "Meadow, Forest and Stream for Play, Profit and Pure Water". This also can be obtained for 50 cents at the offices of the Federation.

In a fore-word commenting on the existing situation in the Region, the Report says:

Two hundred and forty-seven years have passed since Penn drew his first plans for his "Greene Towne". Today we make an accounting. In all these 3500 square miles of the Tri-State District no virgin timber and scarcely a sizable forest remains outside the semi-waste pine lands of New Jersey. Every stream has its share of pollution, making it unsafe for drinking unless treated, and frequently unfit for any recreational use.

As our cities have pushed out into fresh lands they have, with few exceptions, laid low the natural beauty that came in their paths, substituting for this their gridiron streets, artificial parks, and rows of struggling street trees. Millions of dollars have been spent in futile effort to restore or copy the things we have destroyed; things which frequently of necessity had to be sacrificed to expansion, but which in other instances might have been saved. Many miles are being traveled to attain, and great lengths of expensive road are being built to make accessible, out-of-door play and recreation which once existed in greater measure near at hand. A time is approaching when the flooding population now rooted here must look to more distant and more costly sources for water. We have been a prodigal people.

We have wasted our resources and abused our talents. Can we, will we, profit from this experience of the past?

The Report goes on to point out that

There are not less than 200,000 acres of comparatively wasted land in the Philadelphia Tri-State District—this exclusive of the pine lands of New Jersey. This land consists of the steep or marshy banks of streams and bottom-lands subject to periodical floods, of area more or less inaccessible because of rough topography, and land of soil types unfavorable to productive cropping. It has now and probably always will have little or no agricultural value. In close proximity to growing cities or along main lines of transportation it may be found profitable to

reclaim a certain amount of this land for residential and industrial uses. But, even in such favorable location there will be frequent instances where it is not worth the large cost of its improvement for building sites.

The Report adds

On the other side of the picture, this same land, in its natural condition, is picturesque and beautiful. Much of it is wooded and a great deal more could be reforested and made to pay some return from salable timber.

The Report is copiously illustrated with photographs of existing conditions, some of the beauty spots in the Region being shown, and other photographs illustrating the abuse of such natural advantages—an abuse all too common around our great cities. It is also copiously supplied with maps showing the possibilities for parks and parkway development in the Region, in the form of preliminary suggestions for creek valley reservations and for complete and comprehensive parkway systems. Every student of regional planning will find it profitable to obtain copies of these two Reports.

These Reports are so attractively presented that it is regrettable that they are not printed in clearer type. Owing to the somewhat “arty” type that has been used, the text is rather difficult to read. We hope that in subsequent Reports the Federation will overcome this quite unnecessary obstacle to a wider understanding of their purposes and programme.

METROPOLITAN AREAS

Supplementing the work of the Regional Plan of New York, the Merchants’ Association of New York City, through its Industrial Division, some months ago, made public the results of a survey of the New York Metropolitan District which it had completed.

This survey has been made the basis of a suggestion to the Census authorities at Washington that the so-called “Metropolitan Area” around New York should be newly defined. The district which the Merchants’ Association considers may now be counted as the Metropolitan District of New York includes a population of nearly 10,000,000 and an area of 3,767 square miles. The new district embraces not only New York City but portions of 3 states, viz., New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

Some interesting facts are disclosed as a result of this survey. The newly defined Metropolitan area has an average density of population of 2,514 to the square mile; the maximum density of popula-

tion was found in the lower East Side of Manhattan with 200,000 inhabitants to the square mile or a thousand (1,000) times as many as in Somerset County, New Jersey, which nevertheless is a part of this Metropolitan District. All of which goes to show the unequal distribution of population in this vast territory.

In addition to the Greater City itself, the new Metropolitan District embraces a total of 275 incorporated cities, towns and villages; of which 50 have each a population of 10,000 or more; and besides all these, there are included within it, 276 urban communities which are distinct in themselves but which are not incorporated. The total population of the district is found to be 9,472,500, which makes this district in proportion to its area, the most densely populated in the world. It is stated that its population is 1,400,000 in excess of that of all the New England states combined, although the district has but 6% of the land area of those states.

A word as to the industrial conditions within the district is not amiss. Here are found a total of 32,000 factories in which 925,000 wage-earners are employed, and which every hour of the day turn out manufactured goods valued at \$3,000,000. The products of these factories for an entire year are valued at \$8,000,000,000 and the annual payroll works out at something like \$1,400,000,000. These factory products exceed in value all the products of all the factories in New England by a matter of \$500,000,000 a year according to this Survey.

While the district in question has no official entity, the new boundaries have been adopted for use by many commercial and industrial concerns in the reorganization of their sales and merchandising forces, and newspapers, railroads, steamship concerns and shippers generally have adopted it for various purposes.

COUNTY PLANNING A REALITY

IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY

Westchester County in New York, that delightful stretch of suburban and rural country, stretching for miles north of New York City which has already achieved world fame through its marvelous Westchester County Park and Recreation System, has recently added new laurels to her fame by earning the enviable distinction of being the first county in the United States to organize a County Planning Federation consisting wholly of representatives of the municipal governments lying within the county and supported entirely by a budget appropriation from these municipalities. In this respect, the plan of organization would seem to follow quite closely the method of Regional Planning that has been adopted in England.

About three years ago at the suggestion of the Regional Plan of New York, the Mayors of a number of cities in Westchester County joined in a call for a meeting to consider common problems of planning and zoning. At that meeting, attended by 54 delegates, representing 22 municipalities, definite plans for a permanent organization were perfected.

Since that time, the Federation has achieved an enviable record of public service and of effective accomplishment under the enthusiastic direction of its then Secretary, Wayne D. Heydecker, Chairman of the Planning Board of Mount Vernon and also a member of the staff of the Regional Plan of New York. The Report of the first year's operation of this Federation, rendered by its President, Mayor William A. Walsh of Yonkers, shows a really marvelous year of accomplishment. Seven meetings were held during the year at which leading experts in the city planning field made practical addresses and in which live aspects of city planning problems of the county were considered. At other times, motor tours of Westchester County under the auspices of the County Park Commission were had, thus giving to the members of the Federation a first hand knowledge of the problems that confront the other parts of the county which they could not acquire in any other way. During the year, the Secretary has issued 14 mimeograph bulletins, ranging in length from one to seven pages which have covered a variety of subjects, and have served as a medium of communication and information between the members.

Indeed, these little bulletins have had a much larger value and use than this; for, they represent real information on the various aspects of city, town and regional planning, and have had value outside their own local field.

All students of city planning will find it well worth while to study at close range the work of this unique organization and to obtain from Mr. Heydecker at 130 East 22nd Street N. Y. C. copies of these interesting bulletins.

PROGRESS IN THE CHICAGO REGION

The effort at planning the great Region around the city of Chicago continues to make substantial progress.

A word about that Region is not amiss. It contains nearly 1,000 separate governing bodies. A circle with a radius of 50 miles from the loop district of Chicago surrounds or touches most of the counties whose population may commute to and from Chicago. This constitutes the Region. In this area there are

7800 square miles of land; 15 Counties, in whole or part; 230 Townships; 278 Cities and Villages; 400 School Districts; 60 Park Districts; 12 Sanitary and Conservancy Districts and a large number of Drainage Districts. There are about 4,700,000 people in the Region, of which it is estimated 3,150,000 are in the City of Chicago itself.

Today, the population of Chicago is three-fourths of that of the Region. Estimates for 1950 indicate that by that time Chicago will have but 60% of the Region's population.

A Report issued by the Regional Planning Association entitled "Regional Planning Progress in the Region of Chicago" reviews the purposes, the personnel, the procedure, the accomplishments and the future programme of each of its main divisions, and thus considers its work with regard to the Divisions embracing such subjects as

General Surveys, Subdivision Plats and Zoning, Highways, Parks and Forests, Legislation, Drainage, Sanitation and Water Supply.

That, notwithstanding the short period in which the Association has been in existence, its accomplishments have been many is evidenced by a statement under one head, that under Subdivisions, Plats and Zoning. A set of Subdivision Regulations, establishing proper procedure in submitting and recording subdivision plats and setting minimum standards for street, road and alley widths, has been completed for counties and has been put in the form of an ordinance for municipalities. These regulations have already been made effective in 7 different counties, and 17 cities and villages have adopted these rules. Through their operation by county authorities, realtors have dedicated 180 miles of 100-foot right of way and 210 miles of 80-foot right of way, instead of the usual 66-foot widths.

The Zoning Ordinances of the Region, including those of 55 cities and villages, have been put into digest form and are in use by Zoning Commissions, Boards of Appeals, architects, city planners and others throughout the Region. Fifty-eight (58) different zoning ordinances are in effect in the Region. It was largely due to the activities of the Association that 8 of these were adopted during 1926 and 9 more during 1927; 16 others are now being drafted.

We referred in a recent issue* to the important study made by this Association of the space needed to be given up under zoning ordinances for retail business, and the actual study made of the retail business frontage in actual use in 40 different cities in the Chicago Region, from which has resulted the adoption of a new zoning principle, viz., that retail business frontages should be reserved in the ratio of 50 front feet of business property for each 100 of expected population.

* See *Housing*, September, 1923, p. 229.

Similar progress has been made in the other fields of activity of the Association's work.

One of the valuable inquiries undertaken by the Association has been the preparation of a table showing parks in the municipalities within the Region. In each of 43 different communities the area devoted to parks in acres, the similar area devoted to playgrounds, to school playgrounds and the total acreage, thus devoted, as well as the population, and the amount of park area in terms of population, viz., acres of park per 1000 persons—are all set forth.

Another important study which the Association has completed has been one with regard to the Uses of Land in the Chicago Region, classifying such uses as follows:

Present Industrial, Zoned Industrial, Forest Preserves and Parks, Golf Courses, Cemeteries, Residential, Inland Lakes and Rivers, Agricultural, Grazing, Forests and Wasteland.

For each of these classes of use, the Association shows the area in square miles in the Region devoted to that use, the area in acres and the percentage of the total Region thus used.

That the Region is still a largely undeveloped one, becomes apparent when it is realized that 93.4% of all the land of the Region is, at the present time, devoted to agriculture, grazing, forests and waste land.

We commend a study of this Report in detail to all regional planners.

A REGIONAL PLANNING CREED

The following enunciation of his creed as a Regional Planner was made by James Metzenbaum in accepting the Presidency of the Cuyahoga County Planning Congress of Ohio recently:

I here pledge that I will consecrate myself to this promising and inspiring cause of working with you in attempting to so plan this county:

That great highways shall be projected and extended;

That no main thoroughfare shall know of any mere municipal line;

That streets shall be continuous and shall transcend all artificial boundaries;

That parkways may be had while they are yet to be gotten without cost;

That breathing spots and open spaces may be set aside for the present and future inhabitants; and

That for those now here as well as for oncoming generations, the evils of unnecessary congestion may be fended against.

It is to be remembered that the fields of today are the congested districts of tomorrow.

If we accomplish these aims, if we press to a successful conclusion, if we strive on to our goal, we shall here, today, have made history, in having planned and in having begun this great, this public-serving, this far-reaching purpose.

EDUCATING A REGION

The Regional Planning Commission of Los Angeles County has undertaken a valuable educational service in the issuance of a weekly bulletin entitled "Regional Planning Notes", which is sent weekly from its office to a small group of officials and city planning engineers in the county of Los Angeles, and to others who are interested, upon request.

These consist of about 8 notes, multigraphed, each one dated and given a key title. The items are so arranged as to be self-indexing and also so that they may be separately pasted to 4 x 6 filing cards if desired, as wide spaces are left between each Note so as to make it possible to separate them.

Items of local interest and of current news value are included. The notes are really a series of digests of the current news of the day in the Regional Planning field.

As indicative of the value of these notes we append the following note taken from the bulletin of January 19th, 1928:

1-19-28

SUBDIVISION CONTROL

During the past five years the Subdivision Section of The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has taken under its consideration some 1,640 maps of proposed subdivisions. In practically every one, some minor change—and in a great many, complete revision—was needed in order to bring the layout up to the standard "General Requirements for New Subdivisions" by which all were measured. It is, therefore, of interest to note that in only 7% of the cases were appeals made to the Regional Planning Commission itself; and that in from 75 to 80%, the requirements have been fully met and the tracts recorded. This involves an area of over 60 square miles in which proper lot and block sizes have been secured, bad jogs eliminated and the Major Highway Plan protected by dedications. This last item alone means that 84.73 linear miles of 80 and 100-foot highways have been secured to the public without cost for condemnation or widening. These figures deal with unincorporated territory only, and do not include the intense subdivision activity within the 44 cities of the county, many of which exercise similar control.

The notes embrace a wide range of subjects and completely cover the entire field of Regional Planning. We note among the subjects already discussed the following: Planning, Value of; Street Trees; Super-highways; Zoning; Parks; Sub-division Control; Automobiles; Highways; City Planning Commissions; Flood Control; Regional Planning etc.

AN AMERICAN'S IMPRESSIONS OF EUROPEAN HOUSING

Bernard J. Newman, one of America's leading housing experts and the Managing Director of the Philadelphia Housing Association,

attended the International Housing and Town Planning Congress at Paris last July. On his return he summarized his impressions of European housing as he saw it in Italy, France and England, in the following Report, which we feel sure will have much interest for our readers:

IN THE IMPERIAL CITY

In Italy, Mussolini's government as exemplified in Rome considers the results in health and moral betterment of the people through subsidized housing for the poor, a consideration worth paying for as a part of its extensive re-planning programme. Narrow streets are being widened, cutting broad swaths through old and congested housing areas. Unlike similar projects in Philadelphia, where public improvements leave the de-housed population to shift for itself in securing new habitations, Rome is subsidizing the *Institute de la Casa Popolari* so as to enable it to erect dwellings for the evicted families. One hundred million lire a year are being allowed by the government for the use of the Institute for new housing construction.

The plans of the corporation are extensive and unique. Whenever the government is ready to widen a street and tear down old dwellings, the population affected is given advance notice. A majority of the families can and do find new accommodations for themselves. The minority are poor, very poor. The rents they pay are small. Apartments even in old houses are hard to find at a rent within their means. These become beneficiaries of the government's programme. To provide accommodations for all such, until they are able to locate for themselves, the Institute has erected and is continuing to erect large multiple buildings of irregular heights but not exceeding in any part 6 stories. Already 7,000 such family apartments have been completed and 13,000 more are now being planned.

The sites chosen are just beyond the old city walls, on elevated ground. The plots are well laid out and the buildings are of excellent architecture. Each house has a sky-line of three heights. The building area centers around a wide circle. The facades are built back from the street line in an oval. Landscaping is employed to set off the houses. Between the buildings are circular plots with large fountains. The interiors have hallways approximately 8 feet wide with large windows at each end. The halls are very well lighted. The rooms are large. Some units are arranged for one-room occupancy for the very poor; others are in larger apartments. The buildings are all fireproof.

The significance of the plan is not in the design but in the programme for housing families. Thus, the poor who cannot find accommodations when their old houses are destroyed, are rented one or more rooms. Their old furniture is stored in a damp-proof basement. They must use the furniture supplied by the Institute until they demonstrate their capacity to maintain hygienic quarters. The Institute furniture is iron, light and easily moved. Beds, tables, cabinets and closets complete the equipment. Each corridor has separate showers, toilets and lavatories for the apartments facing thereon. Each room has large windows to the outer air. Families are allowed to rent these apartment for three months, during which time they are taught clean and orderly housekeeping practices. At the end of three months, they can move—if they do not do so sooner—into new apartments where they have complete sanitary equipment for each apartment. Rent in these

transitory quarters is nominal. The Management states that families living in squalor in their old housing adapt themselves to their new environment and live more cleanly. The Management further states that even drunkenness and rowdyism are checked. Health and morals are improved. The people I saw—I went into many homes—showed a marked improvement over the types I also saw in the older slum areas from which many of them had come.

Families who move into the larger apartments are permitted to purchase their houses on a monthly rental basis. They may take title simply by paying rent and maintaining continuous occupancy for 25 to 40 years. Thus, Rome is looking far ahead into the future in the transformation of family living from the lowest plane, as found in the slums, to ordinary wholesome living when such families will become an asset to the state and not, as they were, a liability. The plans completed and in process provide for 100,000 persons.

IN MILAN AND NAPLES

In Milan, I could not get the mass figures for new housing, but I visited seven completed operations, some of several blocks in size. The subsidized buildings are all of the multiple housing type as in Naples, where I stopped for a couple of days, but the units are small. They all have separating them open spaces and are built around a large court. All were attractive in appearance considering they were of the tenement type. Most of them were architecturally superior to the average new apartments in Philadelphia. They had a color scheme in stucco and paint that minimizes the exterior ugliness of the average apartment type. They were erected on wide streets affording, in connection with the open areas on the plots themselves, excellent light and ventilation for the apartments. The barrack-like effect of New York and London tenements was absent. Rents are nominal in all government and governmentally subsidized housing, the justification offered being that the need for better housing is imperative. The cost of bad housing in sickness, immorality and crime is so great that the State is justified in its subsidies. Some commercial housing apparently goes on but I did not secure any information as to the extent of its construction.

In all continental housing visited, I was impressed by the need for betterment programmes. Slums are intolerable. Alleys are called streets. Six and eight story houses rise from the street line. Narrow courts afford little light. In old areas, the effect is dismal—equal to the worst housing in Philadelphia and often, because of inadequate water supply and limited sanitary facilities, more deplorable than in Philadelphia. There is the excuse, of course, of age. The cities are so old, most of them, and the housing inheritance is from the past when the need and desire to live within walled cities laid the foundation for narrow passageways, congested construction and crowded occupancy.

FRANCE NOT SO GOOD

In Paris subsidized housing is also under construction. I visited many such operations in and around the city. Paris' new housing does not warrant the high praise well-deserved by Italian projects. Her beautiful boulevards and public buildings remind me strikingly of an unwashed and infested human body clothed in silks. The silks show but the ugliness is only covered. In my rambles in Paris, I saw scores

of families living in one-room apartments, entrance to which was by narrow and long hallways; windows to such apartments were often merely transoms or openings to narrow light wells. Water and toilet fixtures of the crudest type were in dimly lighted halls. Such toilets were often without fixtures, being merely drainage holes in the compartment floor.

In an attempt to meet the problem presented, the French government loans money under the supervision of government officials. The subsidized houses erected within the city limits are multiple buildings, some of which are built around a central, open court of large dimensions, wherein shrubbery and trees are planted. Apartments vary in size from one-room to 5 and, in some instances, 7 rooms. Such buildings are walk-up tenements, 7 stories high. The first floor is given over to stores, the rest to families. The rather strange plan is followed in some, of housing the largest sized apartments on the top floor. There, are accommodated the families with the greatest number of children. This is not so in all cases but of two developments now being completed and both partly occupied, one has 3-room apartments on the second floor, with 6-room apartments on the seventh floor, while the other has 4- and 5-room suites on the first and second floors. Each such apartment has its own water supply and toilet but no wash tubs or baths. Such are provided in separate buildings in or near the operation. Paris places a premium on large families, reducing the rents and giving the larger accommodations to the families of the larger size. No suites may be rented by families of less than 3 children.

Outside the city, but near transportation, Paris is following the example of England in building small cottages. One example of poor judgment was in the misnamed Garden City of Sussane where, out of 14 buildings erected, 9 were 5 stories high and housed 168 families. Plans are underway here to house 480 more families in cottages, 4 families to a cottage. In this operation there was a separate building for shower baths and laundry. With the exception of a drying chamber, no provision for laundrying other than set tubs was provided. A similar incongruity of name was noted in *Cité Jardin* de Stains and *Cité Jardin* de Plessis-Robinson where tenements were the unit-type in the earliest construction. In some of the Garden Cities, as in *Cité Jardin* de Drancy, operated by the Department of the Seine, the cottages were well planned and of good design, but the maintenance was poor. Paris has nothing of a constructive character to teach Philadelphia in better housing.

SLUM CLEARANCE IN LONDON

After leaving Paris, we went to LONDON. It is commonly known that the most extensive government housing programme—with the possible exception of Germany—has been carried on for a number of years in Great Britain. There, during the past 10 years, over one million houses have been completed, either of government housing or of government subsidy. In London and environs, where all of my time was spent while in England, I re-visited the Boundary Street area after an absence of 21 years. This was a slum-clearance proposition. The buildings there are tenements, 5 and 6 stories high, with large, open spaces between the units. Slum-dwellers did not, at first, take kindly to tenement living and some of the tenements erected by the London County Council were not completely occupied for a long

period. When, however, the shortage of dwellings became acute, these buildings were filled. The attendant-in-charge reported that the tenants took good care of their apartments, stimulated by the rigid policy of eviction of those who were slovenly. At present, very few such evictions take place for this cause or for non-payment of rent. There is some slum-clearance being done today by the County Council and by subsidized corporations using government funds.

Both from an artistic point of view and from the point of view of satisfactory environment, the tenements erected are far inferior to the small dwelling construction, like-wise being erected in part by government aid.

My brief survey of old houses designated for demolition did not lead me to believe that the new tenement construction was essential. In the St. Pancreas area, where I visited many blocks and went into a number of dwellings of two stories and basement, I was impressed with the fact that such houses, if in Philadelphia, would not be considered slums to be demolished, but dwellings capable, at a reasonable cost, of being re-conditioned. Their alleged slums—even in their present condition—were far superior to large areas in the slum districts of Philadelphia. The buildings were substantial and would readily lend themselves to repair, furnishing attractive dwellings for their occupants.

Of the other types of housing visited, two stand out as distinctive—the first, Hampstead Garden Suburb, now a part of the London metropolitan area, and the second, the Becontree development.

Hampstead Garden Suburb was laid out according to good town planning technique; the houses were designed for middle class occupancy; were well kept and had attractive exteriors and landscaped yards and gardens.

The other development at Becontree, built by London County Council funds, is a suburban section of the city. The total area of the estate is about 2770 acres. When completed, 375 acres will be in the form of an open belt around the town; 236 acres will be in open space in the town; 30 acres will be set aside for hospital purposes; 40, for industrial, 25, for commercial, and 140, for churches and schools. There are 1770 acres for housing and streets, and the remainder for miscellaneous uses. The entire site has been laid out in the most pleasing manner—a marked contrast to the stereotyped, rectangular squares common to the Philadelphia area. Approximately 14,000 houses have been completed and are occupied.

To be eligible for a cottage in Becontree, a family must be a resident of London. Preference in enrollment is given to those who come from poor sections. The manager-in-charge stated that applicants are notified of available accommodations in the order of their registration and that no exceptions are made to this ruling, for political or other purposes. This has led to a most democratic distribution of tenants. A chimney-sweep may secure a home next to a bank-clerk or to a lawyer or a doctor. The management strives to discourage adjustments of families when they consider themselves among neighbors of a different social scale, but there is a constant manipulation on the part of tenants to move into neighborhoods occupied by more congenial families. If a family does not fit into a community either because of actions objectionable to its neighbors or unwillingness to maintain standards of occupancy established by the Estate, such family is given notice to vacate. When this project is completed, provision will have been made by the London County Council, for 27,000 families in this suburb.

TO SUM UP

Summarizing the impressions gained from this trip, it is very evident, first, that immigration to the United States, from the congested areas of European cities, brings a heritage from inadequate housing, deplorable in character and not conducive to sanitary occupancy and to the maintenance of housing standards recognized in our American cities. The experience of government housing for the very poor, gives promise that even such families, if decently housed, will rise to the level of their accommodations.

Second, European governments are recognizing a responsibility for housing their poor and are subsidizing dwelling construction on their behalf. Many score thousands of such houses have been or are being built.

Third, the fallacy in the programmes adopted is that many houses are of the multiple type, not approved by the specialists in housing employed by such governments, but excused on the ground that land values are such as not to warrant dwelling-type construction. This is inconsistent in that government housing is not self-supporting. Paris is now thinking in terms of the smaller type and housing experts are recommending a lower height, even when land values are high.

But the fourth and strongest impression of all is that government subsidies are not meeting housing problems anywhere, but are fatuously curtailing commercial construction while placing burdens on taxpayers out of proportion to the amount of good they accomplish.

THE FIGHT AGAINST THE SLUM IN PARIS

“The slum kills at least 200,000 Frenchmen every year. It destroys family life, reduces the number of births, increases infant mortality and is the source of the most dreadful physical and moral evils. It is the propagator of tuberculosis which attacks all classes of society. It must be destroyed.”

Thus, the National League Against the Slums of France, founded in 1923 by Madame George Leygues and since then managed by her, characterizes the Universal Enemy. The League conducts its campaign by conferences, lectures, bulletins, billboards, articles in different periodicals, by broadcasting, by movies and in the columns of the general press which lends hearty support. It has recruited thousands of adherents. A very large number of the pupils of the various schools and colleges are included in its membership. The national Government, banks and lending-institutions, chambers of commerce, life insurance companies, building organizations approve of its work and furnish moral and financial support. Prominent members of the foreign colony in Paris have shown on all occasions the most active sympathy.

Since its creation in 1923 the League has instituted a Popular Section to help families to keep up their payments on lots that they

were in danger of losing and to complete homes they were building. In some cases it has even constructed houses.

Its most important work has been the inception of the Garden City of Orly which includes 9 buildings already finished and a community house which is well along towards completion. The League has undertaken this work at an expense of about \$3,000,000 and has in view the construction of about 48 new dwellings this year.

These 9 houses contain 36 apartments. Each apartment comprises a living room, kitchen and laundry on the ground floor, and on the floor above three bedrooms. Each building is equipped with running water, gas and electricity and has a garden of about 300 square feet. The houses are sold to wounded War veterans or to families of workers having at least 3 children under 18 years of age, under the conditions laid down in the Loucheur Law.

The buildings in Orly are purchaseable on the installment plan. The price is 49,000 francs, which is 8000 francs below the market price for such buildings. This purchase price is scaled down according to the disability of the wounded veterans and according to the number of children in the families to whom the houses are sold. A family having 4 children can acquire them at 41,500 francs and a family with 5 children for 39,000 francs, a family with 6 children for 36,500 francs and a family having more than 6 children for 34,000 francs. Every purchaser must make a down payment varying from 3,000 to 4,000 francs for weekly insurance. As many of the families are unable to pay this sum charitably disposed persons are helping by advancing the funds.

Pierre Paraf, urging support of this work, thus describes the conditions under which thousands of Parisians live:

The narrow, dark street, with tall houses whose upper floors seem to converge so as to shut out the sun, hallways in which one stumbles to reach the stairs and of which the stair itself is composed of slimy steps and in addition to all this an odor which clutches you by the throat, obstinate, indefinable, which one may best describe as the odor of misery.

A poor room barely lighted by a little window opening on a dark court or alley. Broken chairs, some books, one or two collapsible beds which are folded during the day and which at night practically cover the entire floor. Such is the ordinary aspect of the Parisian hovel and such sights are in no way exceptions. More than a quarter of the French population is lodged in insufficient or uncomfortable houses. The too rare examinations or investigations which have been held, show that the slum is not merely the scourge of the very poorest. A large number of persons belonging to the middle and lower classes are not able to live in houses which are properly lighted, which have a sufficient number of rooms or are suitable to the needs of the family. The consequences of such a condition is shown in tragic figures. The slum kills 200,000 people a year. In 10 years the total exceeds the loss incurred by the nation in the Great War; above all must be considered the loss due to tuberculosis. The slum is its great ally. Certain slum sections in Paris show 3 times, 4 times and even 10 times the mortality in other sections. Death from cancer, smallpox, enteritis, grippe and typhoid ravages these areas. The infant mortality sometimes attains a percentage of 80%.

PARIS'S GROWING PAINS

For the fourth time in her history, since the Romans built their fortifications around the riverside village of Lutetia, Paris has broken out far beyond her bounds.

The walls which Louis Philippe built to hold a city of 2,000,000 have been leveled as were the Roman walls and defenses of Charles Martel and the old walls of the time of Louis XIV. One by one the gates are being taken away and soon the system by which merchandise entering the city must pay toll will have to be abolished. For Paris is getting ready to embrace her suburbs in a single administration.

The first step taken recently was a decision to extend the subway system out beyond the old walls, a move which was made possible by the merger of the two companies, the Nord-Sud and the Metropolitan. Forty (40) miles of new subway lines are to be built and 15 new suburban stations constructed. It will be possible to travel from the centre of Paris to points 10 miles away and Paris will then start living like New York, with half of its population commuting to work every day.

Once started, it is believed that the subway system will develop far and wide, and in area as well as in population Paris will take rank among the first four cities of the world.